Contact
B.L. Fisher Library
Asbury Theological Seminary
204 N. Lexington Ave.
Wilmore, KY 40390

B.L. Fisher Library's Digital Content
place.asburyseminary.edu

THE INFLUENCE OF THE JEWISH APOCALYPTIC WRITERS UPON NEW TESTAMENT MESSIANISM

BY

MARK ROBIN FAIRCHILD

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF DIVINITY

ASBURY THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

1982

Approved by M. Robert Mulholland, Jr.

Department New Testament

Date July 31, 1982

CONTENTS

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Introduction to the Problem

The writers of the New Testament literature lived and wrote in the context of their own society, using their own contemporary language, and expressing their ideas in the habiliments of their customs and social influences. Among the many cultural influences upon these writers was the literature that was written and read during this period. Thus, just as the writers of today use contemporary terminology and contemporary ideas in expressing themselves, likewise, the first century Christian writers used terminology and ideas commonly used in their day. During the period between the Testaments a particular type of literature, the apocalyptic literature, grew to the extent that it became a major part of intertestamental ideology. This paper originated out of a desire to investigate the extent to which the Christian writers were influenced by these earlier apocalyptic writers.

Problem Statement

This thesis intends to examine the effect of Jewish apocalypticism upon the New Testament eschatological statements concerning the Messiah. This study is limited to the apocalyptic writings of the intertestamental and early Christian periods. This roughly takes in the period from 200 B.C. to A.D. 135. But many writings were made during this extremely active period in the history of Judaism. Thus, how are

the limits of this study to be set?

Scholars generally recognize about ten works as being the core of Jewish apocalyptic teachings. Some scholars recognize more than these ten and others recognize less than these, but for the sake of this paper, the following ten books will be included in this study: I Enoch (or Ethiopic Enoch), the book of Jubilees, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Sibylline Oracles, the Psalms of Solomon, the Assumption of Moses, II Enoch (or Slavonic Enoch), the Ascension of Isaiah, II Esdras (or IV Ezra), and the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch. Naturally, because of the length of these books and the depth of their eschatological understanding, an exhaustive treatment of the subject cannot be attempted. Instead, this paper will attempt to touch upon some of the eschatological points of major significance. In so doing it is hoped that a feeling can be gained for the interchange between these two types of literature.

Theoretical Framework

The job of defining what is an apocalyptic writing is no easy chore. The word "apocalypse" is derived from the greek word ἀποκάλυψις which carries the meaning of "revelation" or "uncovering." D. S. Russell has pointed out that "In the first place it was used to describe a vision, but in the course of time it came to signify books whose contents were believed to be revealed through the medium of such visions."[1] Today, the word apocalyptic refers to such writings as the New Testament book of Revelation as well as to a particular body of

---

[1]D. S. Russell, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964), p. 36.

Jewish literature occurring between the Testaments.

Russell noted several characteristics which when taken as a whole differentiate between the Jewish apocalyptic writings and the other Jewish writings of this period. Among these characteristics are such traits as transcendentalism, mythology, pessimistic historical surveys, dualism, division of time into periods, numerology, pseudonymity, esoterism, angelology, symbolism, and cosmological revelations.[2]

> These various "marks" belong to apocalyptic not in the sense that they are essential to it or are to be found in every apocalyptic writing, but rather in the sense that, in whole or in part, they build up an impression of a distinct kind which conveys a particular mood of thought and belief.[3]

Thus, for this study a particular book must qualify, first, by having these distinguishing characteristics. Second, the book must be essentially Jewish (although it may have had later Christian interpolations). And finally the book must fall within the time period stated above.

Procedure for Investigation

The method for accomplishing this goal will be through the following procedure. First, there will be an examination of the historical setting of Jewish apocalypticism. Here an examination will be made of this disruptive and trying time in Jewish history and an attempt will be made to see the role that apocalypticism had in this period. Second, a study will be made of the individual books in an attempt to sort out the modern critical theories concerning the date, authorship, and eschatological contents of the works. Third, an attempt will be made to try

---

[2]Ibid., pp. 105-6.

[3]Ibid., p. 105.

to find the sources upon which the apocalypticists based their writings. And then finally an examination will be made of particular elements in the New Testament and their relation to the apocalyptic writings in order to determine the extent of apocalyptic influence in the area of Messianic understanding. The elements to be investigated will include the Son of Man, signs and events surrounding the coming of the Messiah, and the names of the Messiah.

Writers often have widely divergent opinions concerning this influence. But today most scholars will admit that the apocalyptic writings influenced the New Testament writers at least to a small degree. Leon Morris remarked that "It is plain that apocalyptic ideas were more widely held in New Testament times than has always been realized. Nobody denies that this type of thinking is behind some, at any rate, of the New Testament."[4] Also "I do not see how it can be denied that apocalyptic was one strand in the fabric of early church teaching."[5] Yet Morris does not see the apocalyptic movement as being the creative force behind Christianity. "That apocalyptic contributed something to Christianity is plain enough, but that it stood to the new faith in the relation of parent to child is going too far."[6] This is an obvious reference to the statement of Ernst Käsemann who claimed that "Apocalyptic--since the preaching of Jesus cannot really be described as theology--was the mother of all Christian theology."[7] Here Käsemann is echoing

---

[4]Leon Morris, Apocalyptic (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ., 1972), p. 10.

[5]Ibid., p. 11.

[6]Ibid., p. 72.

[7]Ernst Käsemann, "The Beginnings of Christian Theology," Apocalypticism, ed. Robert W. Funk, Journal for Theology and the Church, No. 6 (New York: Herder and Herder, 1969), p. 40.

the conclusions reached earlier by Albert Schweitzer, who claimed that both Jesus and Paul were apocalypticists. "The eschatology of Jesus can therefore only be interpreted by the aid of the curiously intermittent Jewish apocalyptic literature of the period between Daniel and the Bar Cochba rising."[8] This is supported by D. N. Freedman who speaks of the

> discovery and subsequent demonstration that the controlling factor in the literature of the New Testament is apocalyptic: that the content and context of the synoptic gospels are inescapably apocalyptic, that the atmosphere in which the early church lived and its frame of reference were overwhelmingly apocalyptic, and that the rest of the New Testament writings to a greater or lesser extent reflect the same prevailing tone.[9]

Still, Morris does not stand alone in his contention that the influence of Jewish apocalypticism was limited. F. C. Porter, a contemporary of Schweitzer addressed and answered the question saying: "Was it true that the gospel as Jesus preached it was an apocalypse? . . . Christ's own relationship was far closer with prophecy than with apocalypse."[10]

Thus, this paper is not a study dealing with whether or not apocalyptic influenced the early Christian writers. This much is admitted. Instead, this paper will investigate the extent of this influence in the area of the role of the Messiah in the eschaton. Furthermore, it must not be assumed that apocalyptic itself was without outside influence. Just as the apocalyptic writings exerted an influence upon other writings, it is also recognized that apocalypticism was influenced

---

[8]Albert Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus (New York: Macmillan, 1948), p. 365.

[9]D. N. Freedman, "The Flowering of Apocalyptic," Apocalypticism, ed. Robert W. Funk, p. 167.

[10]Frank Chamberlin Porter, The Messages of the Apocalyptical Writers, Vol. VIII The Messages of the Bible, ed. Frank K. Sanders and Charles F. Kent (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905), p. 71.

by many factors, including the historical events of this period and other writings--even Christian writings. Christian influences have been detected in several of the later editions of Jewish apocalyptic writings as will be seen in the third chapter. In fact, the Christian community played a major role in preserving these books through the centuries. They even rewrote some of them incorporating Christian elements into them. Thus, the prophets of apocalypticism operated with a give and take effect. While not totally ignoring the "take" aspects of apocalyptic, this paper will rather place the emphasis upon the "giving" aspects in order to see what was given to the New Testament.

Chapter 2

THE HISTORICAL SETTING OF JEWISH APOCALYPTICISM

Precursors to Apocalyptic

Apocalyptic can be seen as a transitional phase of Jewish theology that grew out of Old Testament thought and carried into the New Testament period. It was an attempt by self-proclaimed Jewish prophets to revive the voice of God when the Canonical voice had died. It was an attempt to bolster faith in God when God seemed to be so far away. It was a response of faith to circumstances of despair.

Apocalyptic, in this sense, is unique in Judeo-Christian literature. D. S. Russell called it a "continuation of the Old Testament" and an "anticipation of the New Testament."[1]

> The apocalyptic literature helps to bridge this gap and illustrates certain significant developments in religious belief, especially of an eschatological and Messianic kind, which took place during the vital years between the two Testaments.[2]

To understand how this literature arose, it is necessary to examine the historical period in which it grew. The period of time that is of particular concern for this literature is the time from 200 B.C. to about A.D. 135. George Eldon Ladd notes three main factors that contributed to the rise of apocalyptic.[3] First, there was the rise of

---

[1]D. S. Russell, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964), p. 9.

[2]Ibid.

[3]George Eldon Ladd, "Apocalyptic," Baker's Dictionary of Theology (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1960), pp. 50-52.

a righteous remnant in Israel who wrote protest literature against political and social wrongs and saw themselves as the only remaining community who did not turn from God. Secondly, there was the problem of evil occurring to the Jewish nation with no justice prevailing. And thirdly, there was the problem of the discontinuation of the prophetic voice.

Since the days of Malachi the prophetic voice had disappeared from Judaism and because of the particularly trying times that the people were experiencing many of the Jews apostatized. Many adopted the new influx of hellenism and turned from their ancestral worship. But the pious conservatives patiently endured, all the time wondering how God could put up with such events. As a result, there arose a new movement in Judaism which attempted to revive the voice of the Divine. This probably was not a case of intentional deception by the apocalypticists. Instead, the apocalyptic writers believed that they truly were given a message from God. As Russell said: "The apocalyptic writer shared a sense of kinship with the ancient seer in whose name he wrote and indeed wrote as his representative."[4] By the common use of pseudonyms they "were trying to express what they believed the person in whose name they wrote would have spoken had he been living in their own day."[5]

Another reason for the use of pseudonyms is the result of the prominence of the Torah. In the period following the days of Malachi there was no prophetic voice in Israel. Thus, the Torah rose to supreme prominence as the dominant source of authority. R. H. Charles suggested:

---

[4]Russell, Method and Message, p. 138.

[5]Ibid., p. 134.

> When this view of the law became dominant it is obvious that no man, however keenly he felt himself to be the bearer of a divine message to his countryman, could expect a hearing.
>
> Hence, with a view to gain a hearing such men published a series of books . . . under the names of Ezra, Baruch, Jeremiah, Isaiah, Moses, Enoch, etc.[6]

Furthermore, Charles observed that all Jewish apocalypses

> from 200 B.C. onwards were of necessity pseudonymous, if they sought to exercise any real influence on the nation; for the law was everything, belief in inspiration was dead amongst them, and the canon was closed.[7]

The "Prophets" and the "Writings" were also endued with authority during this period but their status was considered to be somewhat lower than that of the Torah.[8]

Joachim Jeremias promotes a theory that explains the relationship of pseudonyms and the esoteric character of the Jewish apocalyptical writings. "All the apocalypses claim to be secret writings, in order to explain their pseudepigraphal character."[9] This device would explain how such writings were not known and read in popular Judaism

---

[6]R. H. Charles, Religious Development Between the Old and the New Testaments, Home University Library of Modern Knowledge, No. 94. (London: Williams and Norgate, 1927), p. 9.

[7]Ibid., p. 45.

[8]Emil Schürer claimed that the prophets "were respected and used as a veluable legacy of the past long before the canonization was contemplated. But gradually, they took their place beside the Torah as a second category of 'sacred scriptures,' and as people became accustomed to their connection with the Torah, so the latter's specific dignity, i.e., its legally binding and therefore canonic authority, was transferred to them also. . . . Finally, at a still later stage, this corpus of the 'Prophets' (נביאים) was joined by a third collection of 'Writings' (כתובים) which little by little moved into the same category of canonic scriptures. . . . The earliest testimony to their collocation with the Torah is the prologue to the book of Jesus ben Sira (second century B.C.)." Emil Schürer, The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ. rev. ed. by Geza Vermes, Fergas Millar, and Matthew Black, Vol. II (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1979), p. 316.

[9]Joachim Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966), pp. 126-27.

until their days.

> The assumption of Moses is supposed to have been put away with other books in earthen vessels until the day of repentence in Jerusalem (1:16-18, 10:11-13). Pseudo-Ezra is told to publish only twenty-four books (the canonical books of the Old Testament) of the ninety-four that he has written, and to keep back the last seventy (the apocalypses) and give them only to the wise among the people.[10]

Of course during this time Judaism was also experiencing a tremendous growth in the area of its oral tradition. Russell has noted several passages in the rabbinic literature which claim that this oral law had been received by Moses at Sinai along with the written law.[11] Since then it had been handed down orally from generation to generation and "in the course of transmission their 'interpretations' or 'traditions' came to assume a sanctity and indeed a validity equal to that of the written Law itself."[12] Thus, aside from the Law, Prophets, and the Writings, Judaism had two more traditions striving for authority--the oral tradition and Apocalyptic.

Aside from the fact that these two traditions emerged during the same general time period, Russell has found several striking parallels between Apocalyptic and the oral tradition:

(a) Each is of divine origin, for both were received as a revelation from God.
(b) Each claims to be the inheritor of a long tradition within the history of Israel.
(c) Each is of equal antiquity, for both were made known to Moses on Sinai.
(d) Each is of equal authority, for both claim a place alongside the written Torah.
(e) Each claims the name not only of Moses, but also of Ezra the "Second Moses."[13]

---

[10] Ibid., p. 127.

[11] Russell, Method and Message, p. 82.

[12] Ibid., p. 83.

[13] Ibid., p. 88.

However despite these similarities the two traditions took on a significant difference. Jeremias wrote that

> the whole of the oral tradition, . . . was an esoteric doctrine to the extent that, although taught in places of instruction and in synagogues, it could not be propagated by the written word since it was the "secret of God," and could only be transmitted orally from teacher to pupil, because it was forbidden to mingle Scripture with tradition.[14]

Jeremias asserted that the scribes held a special position among the Jewish people since they were the guardians of this secret tradition. "Right down to the second century A.D. the entire oral tradition was treated as the secret of God, being protected from the heathen by the interdict on writing it down."[15] This is supported by the practices of the Essenes who required their members to take an oath to protect the secret teachings of the sect.[16] In the second century A.D., however, the oral tradition was written down, making it accessible to all people. Jeremias remarked that "In this way, most of the doctrine was stripped of its character of esoteric tradition."[17]

On the other hand the apocalyptic writings, likewise esoteric in character, were presented in a written form as early as the second century B.C., and in some cases possibly earlier. These writings how-

---

[14]Joachim Jeremias, Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969), p. 241.

[15]Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, p. 127.

[16]Josephus discussed the procedure for initiation into the sect. The candidate is first tested and tried for three years, whereupon the initiate "is obliged to take tremendous oaths; that in the first place, he will exercise piety towards God; and then, that he will observe justice towards men; . . . and that he will neither conceal anything from those of his own sect, nor discover any of their doctrines to others, no, not though any one should compel him so to do at the hazard of his life." Josephus, The Wars of the Jews II. viii. 7.

[17]Jeremias, Jerusalem, p. 241.

ever maintained a certain secrecy through the years--unlike the rabbinic oral tradition. According to Jeremias these books contained the deepest secrets of God. "They were inspired, like the books of the canon, but surpassed these in value and sanctity."[18] Thus, these esoteric apocalyptic writings were inaccessible to the majority of men.[19]

The first century Christian writings, lack the pseudonymous character. With the advent of Christ as God's spokesman, divine revelation was again established with man. Charles said "the causes, therefore, which had necessitated the adoption of pseudonymity in Judaism had no existence in the Christianity of the first century."[20] The Christian apocalyptic writings which found their way into the canon were thus written under the author's true name.

In his book, Apocalyptic: Ancient and Modern, D. S. Russell claimed that to appreciate Apocalyptic's message "it is necessary to enter into the mind and mood of the writer, to gauge the depths of his feelings and to understand the medium he uses to express his deeply felt convictions."[21] One of the most distinctive feelings in the Judaism of that time is the revived sense of Jewish nationalism. The prophetic messages of Jeremiah and Ezekiel for restoration were partially realized with the return of Zerubbabel, Nehemiah, and Ezra but the Israelites continued to look for the completion of this restoration with political independence. The political upheaval of the Maccabean period

---

[18]Ibid., p. 239.

[19]Ibid., pp. 238-39.

[20]Charles, Religious Development, p. 45.

[21]D. S. Russell, Apocalyptic: Ancient and Modern (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978), p. 1.

did much to promote and influence Apocalyptic. H. H. Rowley said "whatever apocalyptic owes to prophecy . . . and whatever it owes to foreign ideas and influence, it owes more to the circumstances that gave it birth in the Maccabean age."[22] Ward Gasque made the point that even though many of the historical facts surrounding the apocalyptic books are debated, "all are agreed that the book of Daniel provides the prototype for this literary form and that apocalyptic writings arise out of a context of renewed Jewish nationalism, beginning with the Maccabean revolt."[23]

Bearing in mind the pseudepigraphal character of the writings, few references to historical events are mentioned in these writings. The few clues that do exist usually are found in the symbolism that is used or the tone and attitudes of the writer. Often the apocalyptic writer will present an overview of world history from the creation up until the eschaton. And in these historical overviews one is often able to pick out historical allusions. But usually these allusions offer few historical insights. Russell said:

> The apocalyptic books constitute a record of these years, not in terms of historical event, but in terms of the response of faith which the nation was called upon to make. They cannot be understood apart from the religious, political and economic circumstances of the times, . . . The allusions which they make to current affairs are frequently concealed beneath the guise of symbol and imagery.[24]

Thus, one must turn to other writings for the historical background of

---

[22]H. H. Rowley, The Relevance of Apocalyptic: A Study of Jewish and Christian Apocalypses from Daniel to the Revelation, (Rev. ed.; New York: Association Press, 1964), p. 43.

[23]Ward W. Gasque, "Apocalyptic Literature," The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible, ed. Merrill C. Tenney (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publ. House, 1976), I, 202.

[24]Russell, Method and Message, p. 16.

this period. The chief sources for this background are the writings of the Jewish historian Josephus and the first and second books of the Maccabees.

From Alexander to the Beginnings of the Revolt

The setting for the period under question (200 B.C. - A.D. 135) begins back in the days of the Grecian empire. Alexander, a brash and energetic ruler, had taken his armies as far as India in creating the largest empire the world had yet known. Still, Alexander was not merely interested in the conquering and subjugation of other lands. He was tutored by the famous philosopher Aristotle in his childhood and Alexander grew to love the Greek culture. Thus, the victories of the growing Greek empire, were ultimately, victories for the growing influence of the Hellenistic culture as Alexander spread Greek ideology to all parts of the empire. The Lingua Franca of the Near East became Greek and even the religion of the deposed Persian empire (Zoroastrianism) was Hellenized.

However, the leadership of Alexander ended prematurely when he became sick and died in Babylon in 323 B.C. The empire was then divided up among his generals, with Egypt falling into the hands of Ptolemy and Babylon eventually falling into the hands of Seleucus. Palestine, being located between the two empires, found itself to be the unfortunate battleground when either attempted to expand. By 301 B.C. Ptolemy was successful in securing the land of Palestine and the Jews thereby came under the dominion of the Ptolemies for the next one hundred years. These years were hardly peaceful though since the Seleucids and Ptolemies continued to war with one another. However, when Antiochus III (the

great) became the Seleucid ruler in 223 B.C. things changed. On his second attempt in 198 B.C. Antiochus finally defeated the Egyptians and Palestine became a Seleucid province.

Josephus reported that the Jews first welcomed the change and in return received religious freedom and benefits similar to those received under the Persians.[25] But these policies did not last long, since the rulers that followed, beginning with Antiochus IV, attempted to suppress Jewish religious freedom and attempted to impose Hellenistic lifestyles upon the Jews. This led to a revolt and set the tone for the Hellenic-Jewish conflict which was to continue for the rest of the Seleucid empire.

This period was precipitated in part by the cultural changes brought about within Judaism by the influx of the Greek culture. Since the days of Alexander, the Hellenistic ways of life were disseminated throughout the empire. Thus, the Hellenic frame of mind came to be increasingly embraced by the Jews of the diaspora as well as some of the Jews of Palestine. John Bright said:

> Merely to breathe in the Hellenistic period involved absorption of Greek culture. Although godly Jews were not driven by this to any compromising of religious principle, there were other Jews who were . . . becoming so avid for Greek culture that they found their native laws and customs an embarrassment. An irreconcilable schism began to widen within the Jewish community.[26]

This all came to a head under the reign of the son of Antiochus III, Antiochus IV Epiphanes. Upon his ascension to the throne, he found

---

[25]Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews XII. iii. 3, reproduced a letter from Antiochus to the Jews. Here Antiochus promised to supply a "pension" of sacrifices for the temple, and promised to rebuild the temple. The people were also allowed to live according to their own laws and the priests and officials were exempted from paying poll taxes.

[26]John Bright, A History of Israel (3d ed.; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1981), p. 417.

the kingdom in great peril. His father's newly conquered territory was in jeopardy as Antiochus III suffered a defeat at the hands of the rising Roman powers. Antiochus III was killed in Elam soon afterwards, and his son Seleucus IV Philopator reigned for twelve years before being killed by his minister Heliodorus in 175 B.C. When Seleucus' brother Antiochus IV took over, the empire was disorganized and lacked unity. In order to remedy the situation, he attempted to unite the empire under the guise of Hellenism and took upon himself the name Theos Epiphanes (God manifest). This later added to the anger of the conservative Jews, when he committed the blasphemy in the temple, but Antiochus paid little attention. When a certain Jason, backed by the influential Tobiad family, bribed Antiochus and promised to institute a Hellenistic program in Jerusalem; Antiochus gladly appointed him High Priest.[27] And later when a larger bribe was offered with an even more radical program of Hellenization, Antiochus removed Jason and appointed Menelaus to the High Priesthood.[28] This was more than the Jews could bear. Not only was the program of Hellenism revolting to the people, but the fact that a pagan king was removing and appointing the Jewish High Priest added to the beginnings of a revolt. Antiochus, however, considered Palestine to be well in hand.[29] Soon he attempted to subdue the Egyptians by leading his armies into Egypt against the new emperor, the infant Ptolemy VI

---

[27] II Maccabees 4:7-17.

[28] II Maccabees 4:23-29. R. H. Charles in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, vol. II, p. 418 believes that The Assumption of Moses 5:4 refers to the priesthood of Jason and Menelaus saying: "there shall be those who shall pollute the altar . . . even with their gifts, which they offer to the Lord, not being priests, but slaves born of slaves."

[29] I Maccabees 1:16 and Josephus, Antiquities XII. v. 2.

Philometor.

While in Egypt rumors came back to Jerusalem that Antiochus was killed in battle. Thus, the Jews took this opportunity to throw off the Seleucid yoke by deposing the High Priest Menelaus and his supporters. However, Antiochus was not killed and in 169 B.C. upon the return from his victory in Egypt, he "went up against Israel and came to Jerusalem with a strong force. He arrogantly entered the sanctuary and took the golden altar, the lampstand for the light, and all its utensils."[30] Josephus tells us that "when he had gotten possession of Jerusalem, he slew many of the opposite party; and when he had plundered it of a great deal of money, he returned to Antioch."[31]

About that time, Rome entered into an alliance with Ptolemy VI and Egypt's insubordination soon led to a second invasion by Antiochus. In the beginning, he seems to have been successful, but the Roman senate came to the rescue by sending Popilius Laenus to Antiochus telling him to get out of Egypt. Antiochus, obviously embarrassed and humiliated, left. The majority of Jews, meanwhile, still rejected the Hellenization policy, so around 167 B.C., Antiochus sent Apollonius, one of his commanders, to Jerusalem where he "suddenly fell upon the city, dealt it a severe blow, and destroyed many people of Israel. He plundered the city, burned it with fire, and tore down its houses and its surrounding walls."[32] The Jews, nevertheless, still stubbornly resisted Antiochus' policies and this led to a further intensification of Hellenization. Antiochus

---

[30] I Maccabees 1:20-21. Josephus in Antiquities XII. v. 3. mistakenly seems to have assigned this event to Antiochus' second invasion of Egypt.

[31] Josephus, Antiquities XII. v. 3.

[32] I Maccabees 1:30-31. Also see II Maccabees 5:24-26.

was determined to impose Greek culture and religion upon the Jews but the Jews were equally determined to fight it. Finally, Antiochus committed what was in the pious Jewish mind, "the abomination of desolation." He prohibited all practices that were considered sacred by the Jews. Copies of the Torah were burned. Prohibitions were placed upon Jewish sacrifices and offerings, the observance of the Sabbath and feasts, and circumcision. He also had altars and shrines built for idols and commanded that unclean beasts and swine be sacrificed on them. And finally, on the very altar of God, Antiochus had an idol altar built and had a swine sacrificed upon it.

Some of the Jews submitted to the demands of Antiochus: some willingly and some unwillingly, while others did not submit at all. To the pious, the abomination of desolation was simply too much. Antiochus had cast the die, and the impending rebellion merely waited for the opportunity.

From Mattathias to John Hyrcanus

The rebellion began in the little village of Modin about eighteen miles northwest of Jerusalem.[33] Mattathias, a godly priest, and his five sons could not bear the profanation of Judaism in this way and when Antiochus' officers came to the town in order to compel the people to sacrifice, the rebellion broke. The officers asked Mattathias to make the sacrifice, but he refused, whereupon, a Jew from among the people came forward to make the sacrifice. Josephus reported that Mattathias became enraged and

---

[33]The account is described in I Maccabees 2:1-28 and Josephus' Antiquities XII. vi.

> ran upon him violently with his sons, who had swords with them, and slew both the man himself that sacrificed, and Apelles the King's general, who compelled them to sacrifice, with a few of his soldiers. He also overthrew the idol altar, and cried out, "if," he said, "any one be zealous for the laws of his country, and for the worship of God, let him follow me;" and when he had said this, he made haste into the desert with his sons.[34]

A group followed Mattathias and the band engaged in guerrilla warfare against the forces of Antiochus. This group naturally was extremely zealous for the customs of Judaism and for the law and as a result one thousand of their number were massacred when they refused to defend themselves on the Sabbath. When Mattathias learned of the slaughter, he and his men agreed to defend themselves if they were attacked on the Sabbath.[35]

Mattathias soon died and the leadership passed on to his oldest son, Judas who was called "Maccabeus."[36] Under him, the company of pious dissidents met with some striking military successes. First, he defeated a Samaritan force under the leadership of Apollonius.[37] And then Seron led a Syrian army against Judas, with the result that they too were defeated and driven from the land.[38]

As a result of these surprising victories, the rebellion soon

---

[34]Josephus, Antiquities XII. vi. 2.

[35]I Maccabees 2:39-41.

[36]If R. H. Charles is right in The Book of Enoch or I Enoch (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912), p. liii, then the great horn of I En. 90:9 refers to Judas Maccabeus. In this passage the pagan people (represented by eagles, vultures, kites, and ravens) are found to be "devouring" the Jewish people (symbolized by sheep). But a great horn grew up on one of the sheep and all the other sheep ran to it. "And those ravens battled and fought with it, and wished to make away with its horn, but they did not prevail against it" (I En. 90:12).

[37]I Maccabees 3:10-12, also Josephus, Antiquities XII. vii. 1.

[38]I Maccabees 3:23-25, also Josephus, Antiquities XII. vii. 1.

gathered a large following. Zealous Jews from across the land came to join in the revolt. The apocalypticists probably had a large part in this recruitment. Certainly the early Maccabean leaders appealed to apocalyptic motifs to inspire their men for battle.[39] They "believed deeply that there was a moral factor at work in history and that accordingly, there is a judgment upon history and the world's rulers which is inevitable and decisive."[40] Their messages are characterized by the inbreaking supernatural activity of God bringing victory over the powers of men. Evidently Judas picked up on this motif when his men became hesitant to do battle against Seron's larger army. Judas claimed that "it is not on the size of the army that victory in battle depends, but strength comes from Heaven. . . . He himself will crush them before us; as for you, do not be afraid of them."[41]

After Seron's defeat, Antiochus (who was also fighting the Parthians) put Lysias in charge of quelling the Jewish rebellion. The first book of Maccabees claims that Antiochus gave him half of his forces. Lysias in turn appointed three generals and sent them into Judea with forty thousand infantry and seven thousand cavalry.[42] Judas, who was greatly outnumbered, again fired his men with a speech about Yahweh's war, and surprisingly the Israelites won. Second Maccabees claims that they slew over nine thousand of the enemy and sent them fleeing for the homeland.[43]

---

[39] I Maccabees 3:18-22, 4:8-11, 4:30-33.

[40] Russell, Apocalyptic: Ancient and Modern, pp. 12-13.

[41] I Maccabees 3:19, 22.

[42] I Maccabees 3:34, 38-39, also Josephus Antiquities XII. vii. 3. However, these and other military figures may be exaggerated.

[43] II Maccabees 8:24-26.

The defeat was great enough that the next year Lysias himself came to Israel with an even greater army. Josephus and First Maccabees claim that he was accompanied by sixty thousand infantry and five thousand cavalry.[44] But again Judas was victorious in battle. These amazing victories in the face of such seemingly insurmountable odds confirmed the beliefs of the apocalypticists that God was indeed fighting on their side. The Jews celebrated this victory by rededicating the temple and offering sacrifices to God.[45] Martin Noth observed that these battles

> no doubt brought Judas many new followers and fellow-combatants, who had previously held back for fear. But these successes also made it plain to the devout that God was on their side, . . . in fact it appeared that the final issue between the rule of God and the secular rule of man was being decided in these battles, which were concerned to save the foundations of the faith.[46]

Thus, Judas tentatively held the area of Judah for the present time. He immediately cleansed the temple and then attempted to expel the Syrian garrison located in Jerusalem. This, however, caused problems since the garrison appealed for help to Antiochus V Eupator, who took over the throne upon his father's death. Antiochus sent troops and laid seige to the city of Jerusalem. Jerusalem was on the verge of falling when a political crisis forced Antiochus to bring his forces back to the homeland. A hasty truce was arranged and as a result, Judas and the Jews were allowed their religious freedom.

However, Antiochus did not fully keep his treaty. He deported

---

[44] I Maccabees 4:28; Josephus, Antiquities XII. vii. 5.

[45] I Maccabees 4:52-61. The festival of Hanukkah celebrates this event.

[46] Martin Noth, The History of Israel (2d ed.; New York: Harper and Row Publ., 1960), pp. 369-70.

and later killed the despised High Priest Menelaus and then appointed Alcimus, another Hellenist supporter, to be the new High Priest.[47] Alcimus, upon taking office, slaughtered a number of the Hasidim. Thus, Judas and his followers expelled Alcimus from the office.[48] A little later, when Demetrius I Soter gained control of the kingdom and killed Antiochus, Alcimus came to Demetrius and persuaded him to do away with the rebel Judas and to restore his position in the High Priestly office.[49] Demetrius sent Nicanor with an army to dispose of Judas. But Judas defeated Nicanor and killed him.[50] Then Demetrius sent Bacchides and Alcimus with another army into Judea. Judas was hopelessly outnumbered. Nevertheless, he led his men into battle and was crushed. Judas himself was killed and then later his brother Jonathan was appointed to be the leader of the rebels in 161 B.C.

Jonathan inherited a small following and as a result was forced into guerrilla war tactics. Jonathan succeeded in pestering Bacchides

---

[47]Josephus, Antiquities XII. ix. 7.

[48]Martin Noth claims that it was at this time that a vital cleavage took place in the ranks of Judas' followers. Judas was not satisfied simply with religious independence, but he strove for complete political independence. But not all of the Jews agreed with him. Thus, some of the various factions within Judaism developed. The Hasmoneans were gradually foreed into a completely political line while others were concerned only with religious freedom. These were called "the pious" (חס'ד'ם) or the Hasidim and were later called "the separated" (פר'ש'ם) or the Pharisees. Noth, The History of Israel, p. 374. D. S. Russell however claims that this assumption "is hardly justifiable on the evidence available. The hopes of the Hasidim for peace were rudely shattered, and their confidence in Alcimus completely broken when, despite his promise that no harm would befall them, he treacherously seized sixty of their number and slew them (I Macc. 7:15f.)." Thus, it seems that they quickly rejoined Judas as before. D. S. Russell, The Jews from Alexander to Herod (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1967), p. 51.

[49]I Maccabees 7:1-9 and II Maccabees 14:3-14.

[50]II Maccabees 15. At this point the account of II Maccabees ends.

enough that in 157 B.C. another treaty was made and prisoners were released. Bacchides came to realize that he could not accomplish any decisive military victory with the tactics that Jonathan was using. Thus, they made peace and Jonathan was recognized as the leader of the Jews. Later Demetrius was opposed by a competitor to the throne in the person of Alexander Balas. Both men appealed to Jonathan for Jewish support. Whereupon Jonathan supported Balas and was appointed to be High Priest of the Jews.[51] Balas then defeated Demetrius but in a few years, he was challenged for the kingdom by Demetrius II Nicator. When Balas was defeated, another rival, Diodotus Tryphon, attempted to ascend the throne. Tryphon was suspicious of Jonathan's rising power, so he captured Jonathan by trickery and later killed him in 143 B.C. In his place, his brother Simon, assumed command of the Judeans.

With the political situation in the Seleucid empire in such a disarray, Simon upon taking control, immediately attempted to secure the complete political independence of the Jewish people. Simon sent a delegation to Demetrius II asking for the recognition of the Jewish people as an independent state in exchange for which Simon would support Demetrius. The agreement was made and Judea became a recognized state. Later Demetrius was captured by the Parthians whereupon Simon then teamed up with Demetrius' brother, Antiochus VII Sidetes, to finally do away with the resurgent troublemaker Tryphon. But when Antiochus secured his position on the Seleucid throne, he turned against Simon who

---

[51] R. H. Charles in The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1908), p. xliii, stated that the references to the priest-kings in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs probably refer to the Maccabean rulers who also assumed the priestly role (e.g. Test. Reuben 6:10-11). This is also probably the time when belief in a Levitic Messiah began (see chapter 5).

had gradually been gaining power in Judah. In the military conflict that followed, Antiochus' forces were defeated and Judah was again secure in Hasmonean hands. Around 134 B.C. however, Simon was killed by his son-in-law, Ptolemy, who was trying to gain power in Palestine.[52] His wife and two of his sons were captured, but a third son, John Hyrcanus, escaped and continued to lead the Judean people.

From John Hyrcanus to Simon Bar Kochba

The job of leadership was made difficult for John Hyrcanus by Antiochus VII who, Josephus claims, invaded Judea in the first year of Hyrcanus' reign.[53] After laying seige to the city of Jerusalem a treaty was drawn up and Antiochus withdrew leaving Judah in the hands of John Hyrcanus. After this, the power of the Seleucid state began to decline while, on the other hand, John made some substantial gains for the Judeans.[54] Oesterley claimed that

> The reign of John Hyrcanus was of special importance for several reasons: he extended very considerably the borders of his dominions; . . . he subdued the Samaritans, and destroyed their temple on Mount Gerizim; he broke with the Pharisees (the chasidim of earlier days), . . . he supported the party of the Sadducees; and finally, during his reign arose the pronounced popular hatred of the Hasmonean rulers, owing mainly to the incongruity of the pursuit of worldly aims on the part of him who held the High Priestly office.[55]

---

[52] I Maccabees 16:11-17. The account of I Maccabees ends with the death of Simon and the rise of John Hyrcanus.

[53] Josephus, Antiquities XIII. viii. 2.

[54] Charles Cutler Torrey in The Apocryphal Literature: A Brief Introduction (New Haven, CN: Yale University Press, 1945), p. 113, concluded that the great horn of I En. 90:9 which led the sheep (the Jews) against the birds of heaven (the pagans) was John Hyrcanus. R. H. Charles, however, held that the great horn was a reference to Judas Maccabeus.

[55] W. O. E. Oesterley, An Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1935), p. 30.

This is supported by Josephus who tells of a dispute between John and the Pharisees.[56] As a result of this dispute, John left the Pharisees and supported the Sadducees and thus, he stirred up the hatred of the mass of common people.

After John Hyrcanus, Aristobulus I ruled for one year, and then Alexander Jannaeus took over. Aristobulus' wife Alexandra (Salome), appointed Jannaeus king and then married him. Jannaeus was a cruel and barbarous ruler, who was obviously not the right kind of man for the High Priesthood which by this time was combined with the political office. Naturally Jannaeus was opposed by the Pharisees, who believed that such an impious man should not be allowed to act as the High Priest. On three different occasions the Jews rebelled against Jannaeus and each time he responded by slaughtering them. On the last occasion they even brought in armies from the Seleucid king Demetrius III. At first Jannaeus was defeated and fled Jerusalem. But later he was able to come back and regain his position. Oesterley said that "although Jannaeus conquered here too, and took most barbarous revenge on the Pharisees,[57] he realized towards the end of his life that their power, owing to their influence over the bulk of the people, made it politic to conciliate them."[58] Thus it is not surprising to read in Josephus

---

[56]Josephus, Antiquities XIII. x. 5-6, told of a banquet given by Hyrcanus in which he invited members of both the Pharisaic and Sadducean parties. Hyrcanus asserted his willingness to please God and asked those present if there was anything that he did that was offensive. A Pharisee named Eleazar declared that Hyrcanus ought to lay aside the High Priesthood and to be content with just governing the people. Hyrcanus was enraged by this statement and believing that it was the position held by the rest of the Pharisees, he shifted his support to the Sadducees.

[57]R. H. Charles in The Book of Enoch, p. liii, claims that the persecution and destruction of "the righteous" in I En. 103 refers to Jannaeus' slaughter of the Pharisees.

[58]Oesterley, Introduction, p. 31.

that Jannaeus later told his wife Alexandra to "put some of her authority into the hands of the Pharisees . . . for they had power among the Jews, both to do hurt to such as they hated, and to bring advantages to those to whom they were friendly disposed."[59]

Upon the death of Jannaeus, Alexandra took over control of the state. She followed her husband's advice and made several of the Pharisees her advisors. But, since she was a woman, Alexandra could not be the High Priest. So she appointed her son Hyrcanus II to be the High Priest while she acted as the ruler. Hyrcanus II also supported the Pharisees and thus he ran into trouble with the Sadducees who by this time were avowed enemies of the Pharisees. Since the Pharisees were in control, the Sadducees now came under persecution.

When Alexandra died in 67 B.C., her two sons (Hyrcanus II, who supported the Pharisees, and Aristobulus II, who supported the Sadducees) fought for control. Hyrcanus was entitled to become the ruler, but his brother was much more aggressive. At first Aristobulus won and became the ruler; but later under the instigation of the Idumean Governor Antipater, Hyrcanus II joined himself with the Nabateans and beseiged Jerusalem. At this point the rising power, Rome, intervened. They ordered Hyrcanus to lift the seige, and to end the civil strife in Judah. Hyrcanus complied, but when he did so, Aristobulus attacked him. Both Aristobulus and Hyrcanus appealed to the Roman general Pompey for support. But when Aristobulus showed signs of insubordination Pompey

---

[59]Josephus, Antiquities XIII. xiii. 5-14.

laid seige to Jerusalem and in the end, Hyrcanus won his support.[60] Aristobulus was imprisoned and Hyrcanus was made the ruler and High Priest.[61] However, the struggle for personal power was costly. Hyrcanus in turning to Rome for help, submitted himself to the demands of Rome. Hyrcanus was made a subservient ethnarch under Roman control and from this point onwards, Judea was made a Roman province.

Later Antipater, an Idumaean who helped Hyrcanus II in his conflicts with Aristobulus II, came into the favor of the Romans and was appointed procurator of Judea.[62] He appointed his sons Phasael and Herod to be governors in the land and when he was poisoned, Herod soon rose to prominence. Antigonus, a son of Aristobulus II, took over the leadership of the nation in 40 B.C. with the help of the Parthians. However Herod, supported by the Roman army, defeated Antigonus and became the king of the Jews in 37 B.C.[63] Oesterley said that Herod was extremely hated by

---

[60]Several scholars, such as G. Buchanan Gray in R. H. Charles' The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, vol. II, pp. 629-30, claim that several passages in the Psalms of Solomon refer to Pompey and the Romans. For example in Ps. Sol. 2:1-3 it is mentioned that "when the sinner waxed proud, with a battering-ram he cast down fortified walls, . . . Alien nations ascended thine altar. They trampled it proudly with their sandals; because the sons of Jerusalem had defiled the holy things of the Lord." Also see other probable references in 8:18-24 and 17:24-27.

[61]Josephus, Antiquities XIV. i. 4.

[62]Josephus, Antiquities XIV. viii. 5.

[63]Charles in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, vol. II, p. 411, asserted that the Assumption of Moses 6:2-6 refers to Herod when it is said that there shall arise "a self-willed king, who shall not be of the priestly line, a rash and wicked man, . . . He shall cut off their chief men with the sword and bury them in unknown places, . . . He shall slay old men and young men and shall not spare. Then shall there be bitter fear of him among them in their land, and he shall execute judgment upon them, as did the Egyptians, for thirty and four years, and shall punish them."

the Jews and notes several reasons for the hatred:

> One of his first acts was to put to death a number of influential citizens who had sided with Antigonus . . . Also the people had an initial cause of hatred for him owing to his being an Idumean; then there was the fact that he had displaced a Hasmonean prince. . . . A cause of even deeper hatred was that Herod was the friend and protege of Rome.[64]

Eventually, this hatred materialized in a more concrete form. Thus it was during the reign of Herod that another division occurred in Judaism. This is described as a

> rift between the party of the Zealots, who originated in Galilee, and the Pharisees. They had been associated at first, but the cause of the break was that the Pharisees were content to acquiese in Roman overlordship, represented in the person of Herod, while the Zealots refused to recognize any earthly King. Ultimately, the Zealots, with the direst consequences, gained the bulk of the people to their side.[65]

Josephus seems to refer to this sect as "a fourth philosophic sect" beside the Essenes, Sadducees, and the Pharisees and he claims that "Judas the Galilean was the author."[66] Elsewhere, Josephus claimed that "this man got no small multitude together, and broke open the place where the royal armor was laid up, and armed those about him."[67] The following years witnessed several small revolts and continued resistance to Roman authority. Here, undoubtedly, the apocalyptic literature again figures to have been a primary motivator for the cause.[68] F. C. Porter calls the apocalypses "the most important documents of the revived national faith which first inspired Judas and his followers and created

---

[64] Oesterley, Introduction, p. 34.

[65] Ibid., p. 35.

[66] Josephus, Antiquities XVIII. i. 1,2,6.

[67] Josephus, The Wars of the Jews II. iv. 1.

[68] Josephus, The Wars of the Jews II. xiii. 4.

the Hasmonean Kingdom, and then at last inspired the Zealots and led to the suicidal attempt against Rome."[69]

Nevertheless, Herod ruled his Palestinian province until he died in 4 B.C. At that time the area was divided up and his sons were appointed to be rulers of their respective areas. Judea and Samaria were ruled by Archelaus, whom Oesterley called "the least fitted of Herod's sons to be a ruler."[70] He aroused the enmity of the Jewish people and they appealed to Caesar, who replaced him with a Roman procurator.

> The history of Judea under the procurators during the next thirty years is a deplorable record of misgovernment, with the inevitable consequence of ever-growing resentment on the part of the Jews, together with increasing resistance to constituted authority.[71]

The tension continued to build until Spring A.D. 66 when the Roman procurator Florus attempted to raid the temple treasury. This enraged the Jews and they rose and defended the temple. Soon, the incident spread throughout Judea and the angered Jews began to prepare for a revolt against Rome. The High Priest and some of the Pharisees attempted to calm the people down, but the Zealots won over the masses and the war was begun.

The Zealots initially met with success, but when the full force of the Roman armies arrived, the opposition was overwhelming. It eventually took four years before the Roman armies destroyed Jerusalem and then another three years before the last Jewish stronghold, Masada, was

---

[69]Frank Chamberlin Porter, The Messages of the Apocalyptical Writers, Vol. VIII, The Messages of the Bible, ed. Frank K. Sanders and Charles F. Kent (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905), p. 3.

[70]Oesterley, Introduction, p. 36.

[71]Ibid.

taken. But, by A.D. 73, the war was over. The resistance was quelled and, most importantly, the backbone of the Jewish culture, the temple, was destroyed.

However, even this was not the final revolt by the Jews against the Romans. In A.D. 132 Simon Bar Kochba, declaring himself to be the Messiah, gathered a following and seized Jerusalem. But this revolt, like the one sixty five years earlier, was destined for failure. Like the previous revolt, this one met with some initial success, but like the previous revolt, this one also could not endure the strength of the Roman forces. By A.D. 135 the struggle was over.

The Apocalyptic Writings in Jewish Life

In view of the discoveries at Qumran, interest has centered around another one of Josephus' "philosophic sects." This community on the shores of the Dead Sea has often been identified as being of the party of the Essenes. Since it is not the purpose of this paper to enter into this debate, it will be assumed that this is correct. It is unknown where the Essenes came from but

> it is a reasonable supposition that the Essenes of Qumran split off from the main body of the Hasidim when Jonathan and Simon claimed for themselves the High Priestly title and prerogatives, in highhanded disregard of the Biblical traditions.[72]

Freedman claimed that this apocalyptic group gradually came to realize that the Maccabees were not the ushers of the eschaton. Thus, they withdrew from the corrupted society and organized the life of the community

---

[72]David Noel Freedman, "The Flowering of Apocalyptic," Journal for Theology and the Church, No. 6, ed. Robert W. Funk (New York: Herder and Herder, 1969), p. 170.

in anticipation of the coming eschaton.[73] F. F. Bruce declared that "their existence as a community cannot be traced back earlier than the middle of the second century B.C." and he noted that Josephus first mentioned them in connection with Jonathan (160-143 B.C.).[74]

Documents from the Qumran community such as the Temple Scroll from Cave XI and the War Scroll support the apocalyptic nature of the sect. Freedman suggested that this community was apocalyptically motivated to participate in the Jewish uprising against Rome from A.D. 66-73. "It is certain that the Qumran community was overrun by the Roman army in 67 C.E., and also that some Essenes at least were active in the revolt."[75] Freedman further suggests that "It is reasonable to suppose that Essene groups believed that the awaited day had in fact arrived and participated actively in the revolt."[76] In A.D. 132 a parallel to this apocalyptic expectation occurred when war broke out with Rome. Here the disillusioned Rabbi Akiba announced that the Messianic age had begun and that this would be brought about through the work of Simon Bar Kochba, the Prince of Israel.[77]

Undoubtedly the apocalyptic writings had much to do with the shaping of this historical period. D. S. Russell wrote:

> Not only did these apocalyptic books mirror the historical situation out of which they arose, they at the same time actually helped to create it. This was imflammatory material in the hands of those who wished to appeal to the religious fanaticism which became a feature

---

[73] Ibid., p. 171.

[74] F. F. Bruce, Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ., 1961), p. 131.

[75] Freedman, "Flowering of Apocalyptic," p. 172.

[76] Ibid.

[77] Ibid.

> of a particular section of the Jewish people. There can be little doubt that the Zealot party, for example, found in this literature just the kind of propaganda they needed to set alight the smouldering passions of their fellow countrymen.[78]

These books are generally spoken of as the secret writings. Thus, the general populace probably never had very much direct exposure to them. But the books seem to have been quite popular with the guardians of the tradition (the priests and the scribes). The book of IV Ezra claims that Ezra under divine empowering was able to dictate ninety-four books to five scribes in a period of forty days. The twenty-four books (the O.T. canonical writings) were supposed to be given to the common people, but Ezra was ordered to "keep the seventy that were written last, in order to give them to the wise among your people."[79] These seventy books are assumed to be apocalyptic writings. Russell noted that "Three times over (in 14:6, 26, 45) stress is laid on the secret character of certain of the books--an expression which appears frequently with reference to apocalyptic writings."[80] The masses probably received this teaching primarily through the teachings of their religious leaders. Nevertheless, they likewise soon caught the apocalyptic fervor. Russell observed that

> Apocalyptic was not a "popular" literature in the sense that it was written for the masses. . . . The ideas contained in these books, however, were much more widespread than the books themselves and continued to exercise a strong influence even long after the books had dissappeared.[81]

With all the disruptions and turmoil that were going on for

---

[78] Russell, Method and Message, p. 17.

[79] IV Ezra 14:46

[80] Russell, Method and Message, p. 87.

[81] Ibid., p. 28.

these three centuries, it is amazing to see that literarily it was one of the most productive periods in the history of Israel. R. H. Charles said that this was a period of greater spiritual progress than any that had preceeded it in Israel.[82] Oesterley cited two reasons for this:

> there were times of respite . . . this offered opportunities for those who felt impelled by the events of the times to put forth messages to the people to undertake their task . . . . Apart from this, it must be recognized that these wars and internal dissensions were in themselves incentives to many to produce writings; . . . The paramount need of the people during those times of stress was to be strengthened and heartened by encouragement and hope--encouragement to trust in their God, and hope that He would help them. This is one of the main themes of the Apocalyptic literature.[83]

This period was a trying time for those who had long trusted in the God of Israel. For many, their faith was being severely tested. Many Jews during this time bent to the pressure and adopted the Hellenistic culture, while others attempted to Hellenize Judaism. But still others refused to compromise their faith with the pagans. The apocalypses probably came from these people as they sought to justify God and encourage faith in him. Leon Morris claims that apocalyptic "should not be understood in opportunistic terms, or in terms of world wisdom or of fanatical piety. It was 'the response of faith,' responding to the times."[84] Freedman said

> It is our conviction that apocalyptic was one of these basic common elements, perhaps the single most important in Judaism during much of this period, providing a framework of thought and belief, a norm of behavior, and a goal of faith and hope.[85]

One of the questions that has frequently been asked is, where

---

[82]Charles, Religious Development, p. 34.

[83]Oesterley, Introduction, pp. 39-40.

[84]Leon Morris, Apocalyptic (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdman's Publ., 1972), p. 25.

[85]Freedman, "Flowering of Apocalyptic," p. 168.

within Judaism did apocalypticism arise? In 1905 F. C. Porter defended the position that the apocalyptic books on the whole came from the Pharisaic party of Judaism. He claimed that these books were written by Jews who were oppressed, had no power, and had little hope in the present course of events. Thus, Porter said that they wrote the apocalypses as a "protest of those who are weak and oppressed and whose faith demands a speedy change in the present intolerable condition."[86] Their rise to prominence within Judaism led to a rejection of apocalypticism within the Pharisaic party. They had now matured from their beginnings and had grown to become the dominant force in Judaism. So by the end of the first century A.D. Judaism no longer had a need for apocalypticism, and thus, they abandoned it.

R. H. Charles came to essentially the same conclusion saying, "I have emphasized the original and fundamental identity of apocalyptic and legalistic Pharisaism in respect to devotion to the law."[87] Others have denied that apocalyptic was a part of intertestamental orthodox Judaism. Instead, they see apocalyptic as being an aberrant product of a schismatic minority. Charles, however, said that such a denial "is absurd, seeing that Talmudic Judaism no less than Christianity, owes its spiritual conceptions of the future to apocalyptic. The affinity between Jewish apocalyptic and legalism is essential, since the law was for both valid eternally."[88]

> Legalistic Pharisaism in time drove out almost wholly the apocalyptic element, and became the parent of Talmudic Judaism . . . the

---

[86] Porter, Messages of the Apocalyptical Writers, p. 14.

[87] R. H. Charles, Religious Development, p. 34.

[88] Ibid.

> Judaism that survived the destruction of Jerusalem was not the same as the Judaism of an earlier date.[89]

W. D. Davies likely would agree in point with the two above mentioned writers. Davies, however, prefers to maintain both the differences and the similarities in these writings. "To deny the differences of emphasis in apocalyptic and Pharisaism would be idle, but it is grievously erroneous to enlarge this difference into a cleavage."[90] Thus that there are elements in Pharisaism that oppose the apocalyptic writings seems evident, but there is a certain overlap of these theologies. This overlap could indicate a common origin of both of these kinds of thought, but at a minimum this indicates that there was no radical conflict dividing the two.

Yet, D. S. Russell does not believe that the apocalyptic writings can be limited to any one Jewish sect.

> It would be wrong to confine their production or their use to any one party within Judaism. Be that as it may, there is good reason to believe that right through the oppressive reigns of the Herodian kings and the testing years of the Roman procurators, culminating in the Jewish war of A.D. 66, they were a considerable source of encouragement and strength to the entire Jewish people as they faced dire peril and the threat of extinction at the hands of their enemies.[91]

There exists a tension here in the argument that seems rather apparent. Apocalyptic was not the product of a small group in Judaism. The teachings were too widely known and popular for this to be true. But yet, the recognition should be made that apocalyptic is not synonymous with Judaism. There are differences in apocalyptic writings and

---

[89] Ibid., p. 35.

[90] W. D. Davies, Christian Origins and Judaism (London: Darton, Longmans, and Todd, 1962), p. 29.

[91] Russell, Apocalyptic: Ancient and Modern, p. 3.

other Jewish teachings. Moreover, it is obvious that at some time, mainstream Judaism turned and finally rejected these books.

> The Rabbis were essentially backward looking, the apocalypticists forward looking. The Rabbis could not come to terms with the apocalyptic view of life. It is significant that the apocalypses were preserved for the most part not by Judaism but by Christianity. Those apocalypses which made no appeal to the Christians have usually perished.[92]

Thus, the Jewish community probably was not united in any one system of belief. There were many conflicting beliefs.

Leon Morris believes that there was a movement (not a sect) that began to materialize within Judaism during the intertestamental period. This movement probably consisted of people from all parts of Judaism. Morris described these people as being the "enthusiastic section of the nation" and claims that the movement was a departure from the more rigid, formal and official kind of Judaism.[93] He explained that these enthusiastic Jews emphasized new revelations and God's action among men. They were not as formal as the Pharisees or Sadducees, although they still had a high respect for the law. The apocalypses came from this sector of Judaism and later a large part of the Christian community emerged from these beginnings. This was the atmosphere in which Jesus lived and the early church began its pilgrimage.

---

[92]Morris, Apocalyptic, p. 69.

[93]Ibid., pp. 13-14.

Chapter 3

DATE, AUTHORSHIP, AND ESCHATOLOGICAL CONTENTS OF APOCALYPTIC BOOKS

Introduction

This chapter will take the ten apocalyptic books alluded to in the first chapter and will discuss the dating, authorship, and the eschatological contents of these books. But, before discussing these books a word should first be said about the book of Daniel.

The book of Daniel is often characterized as "the first and greatest of the Jewish apocalyptic writings" and "the only one of its kind to find a place in the Canon of Scripture."[1] Corresponding to this view scholars often date this book during the reign of Antiochus IV Epiphanes in the second century B.C. Others, however, while agreeing that the Book of Daniel is a prototype for the later apocalyptic writings, note that there are significant differences between Daniel and these writings. Ladd, for example, claims that

> in view of the fact that it shows prophetic traits which are lacking in the other apocalypses, Daniel must be contrasted as well as compared with the noncanonical writings, for it stands between the prophetic and the fully developed apocalyptic writings.[2]

These scholars assert that the book should be dated in the sixth century B.C. or claim that at least "it embodies traditions of a historical person who lived in the time of the captivity."[3]

---

[1]D. S. Russell, The Jews from Alexander to Herod (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967), pp. 220-21.

[2]George Eldon Ladd, Jesus and the Kingdom: The Eschatology of Biblical Realism (New York: Harper and Row Publ., 1964), p. 75.

[3]Ibid., p. 81.

In support of the second century B.C. date Otto Eissfeldt says "It can be clearly proved that the book derives from the period between the return of Antiochus IV from his second campaign against Egypt (167) and his death in April 163."[4] The earlier date is set by Dan. 11:29-39, in which "the second campaign is so exactly 'prophesied' that we here clearly have vaticinium ex eventu."[5] The later boundary is set by Dan. 11:40ff. where a prophecy is made of the king's death. This prophecy does not agree with the actual facts of Antiochus' death, so Eissfeldt believes that Daniel must have been written before Antiochus' death.

To support this conclusion, Eissfeldt points to the fact that Daniel appears in the third section of the Jewish Canon (the writings) rather than in the Canon of the prophets.[6] This would indicate that Daniel was written too late to be included in the Prophets. Also Eissfeldt notes that Ben Sirach (written about 190 B.C.) does not mention Daniel in his list of famous fathers (chapters 44-50), but I Macc. 2:59-60 (written about 100 B.C.) does mention him.

Further evidence is cited by Russell who claims that "Linguistically the book as it stands cannot be anything like as early as the sixth century B.C. This is shown by the late style of the Hebrew, . . . and also by the appearance in the text of Persian and Greek loan-words."[7] He also adds that "Historically there are certain discrepancies which

---

[4]Otto Eissfeldt, The Old Testament: An Introduction, trans. Peter R. Ackroyd (New York: Harper and Row, Publ., 1965), p. 520.

[5]Ibid.

[6]Ibid.

[7]Russell, The Jews from Alexander to Herod, p. 221.

are to say the least surprising, if the book is a product of the exilic period."[8]

However, those who argue for an earlier date claim that Daniel was not included in the prophetic Canon because he was not strictly a prophet, but rather was a government official.[9] Also it is noted that other books of an early date (such as Job, the Davidic Psalms, and Solomon's writings) were included in the third Canon. In response to the fact that Ben Sirach does not mention Daniel in his list of famous fathers, R. K. Harrison holds out the possibility that "Ben Sira deliberately excluded Daniel from his list of notables for unknown reasons, as he did also with Job, and all the judges except Samuel, as well as Kings Asa and Jehoshaphat, Mordecai, and even Ezra himself."[10] Furthermore, Harrison disputes the historical inaccuracies in Daniel and claims that an appeal to linguistic evidence and Persian and Greek loan-words as evidence for a late date "has undergone sobering modifications of late as a result of archaeological discoveries in the Near East."[11] Harrison even goes so far as to say "the author possessed a more accurate knowledge of Neo-Babylonian and early Achaemenid Persian history than any other known historian since the sixth century B.C."[12]

Archer adds that archaeological discoveries have turned what was previously considered a historical error into a weighty piece of

---

[8]Ibid.

[9]Gleason L. Archer, Jr., A Survey of Old Testament Introduction (Chicago: Moody Press, 1974), p. 380.

[10]Roland Kenneth Harrison, Introduction to the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ., 1969), p. 1123.

[11]Ibid., pp. 1112-24.

[12]Ibid., p. 1120.

evidence in favor of an early date for Daniel.[13] It was previously thought that the mention of Belshazzar as king (in Dan. 5:30) was an error. But discoveries have shown that Belshazzar served as a co-regent with his father Nabonidus, and when Nabonidus took up residence in Teman, North Arabia, Belshazzar was left in control of Babylon.

> There is an additional detail in this account that makes the theory of late authorship very difficult to maintain, and that is that the writer of chapter 5 quotes Belshazzar as promising to the interpreter of the inscription on the wall promotion to the status of third ruler in the kingdom (5:16). Why could he only promise the third and not the second? Obviously because Belshazzar himself was only the second ruler, inasmuch as Nabonidus his father was still alive."[14]

It is questionable whether a second century author would have been aware of this information.

Thus, there is a great deal of tension concerning the date of Daniel, and it may very well be that the solution to the problem lies in a position half-way between the extremes. Perhaps the book of Daniel contains traditions that extend back to the Daniel of Babylon but were finally written down in their final form during the reign of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.

Whatever the case may be, for the purposes of this paper, the book of Daniel will not be treated as one of the intertestamental apocalyptic writings. Yet, references to the impact of this book will be noted in several places. As Russell says: "the book of Daniel cannot be regarded as 'typical' of this genre of literature; nevertheless it set a pattern which many other writings followed, and exercised a powerful influence both on Judaism itself and on the emerging Christian faith."[15]

---

[13]Archer, A Survey of Old Testament Introduction, pp. 382-83.

[14]Ibid., p. 383.

[15]Russell, The Jews from Alexander to Herod, p. 220.

I Enoch or Ethiopic Enoch

Scholars agree that I Enoch is not the work of a single author, but rather is a composite work written by several people. Thus, any discussion about the date and authorship is complicated by the source theories and the fragment reconstructions of the scholars. Naturally there is wide disagreement upon the subject and a study of this sort must be approached with an open mind. The division of the book (or rather books) of Enoch can be a rather subjective endeavor catering to the whims of a particular author, and the dating of the sections is generally dependent upon possible historical allusions and borrowings from (or by) other ancient writers. Thus, an attitude of clement receptivity must be maintained while the evidence and suggested conclusions are stated.

While this book has been called "the best typical example of an apocalypse"[16] it is not to be assumed that the entire book is eschatological. Enoch contains one hundred and eight chapters which make up the five major sections along with an introduction and conclusion. The second section (chapters 37-71) contains three parables, two of which (45-57 and 58-69) concern the eschatological "Son of Man" or the "Elect One." The fourth section (83-90) deals with the eschatological "New Jerusalem" which is represented as a kingdom set up by God upon the earth. The fifth section (91-104) contains the "Apocalypse of Weeks" where the entire world history is divided into ten weeks, three of which are yet future. This section also speaks of the new heaven, a resurrection of the righteous and the judgment. It should also be said that

---

[16] Charles Cutler Torrey, The Apocryphal Literature: A Brief Introduction (New Haven, CN.: Yale University Press, 1945), p. 110.

other sections deal with eschatological themes, but the eschatology is not as prominent as the above sections. Likewise, Messianic references are found scattered throughout the book. The sections which especially concentrate on the Messiah and Messiah-related topics are found in chapters ten and eleven, thirty-eight and thirty-nine, fourty-five to seventy-one, ninety and ninety-one, and one hundred and five.

Concerning the dates of the various parts, there is much disagreement. J. T. Milik postulates the widest period of time between the various elements by suggesting that the sources were written over a period of five centuries. The Book of Watchers (chapters 12-36), he claims, was written in the middle of the third century B.C. by a Palestinian Jew.[17] On the other hand however, he says "it is around the year A.D. 270 or shortly afterwards that I would place the composition of the book of Parables."[18] This seems to unduly extend the writing of I Enoch and Leonhard Rost seems justified in his criticism: "If Milik's thesis is accepted, the book gradually came into being over the course of four hundred years and was not finished until the second century C.E."[19] Actually, though, it would be five hundred years extending into the third century.

R. H. Charles bases his dating of I Enoch partly upon the supposition that the book contains large portions of an earlier work--the lost book of Noah. This book is mentioned in the Book of Jubilees 10:13 and 21:10. Charles claims that fragments of this book are preserved

---

[17]J. T. Milik, The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), p. 28.

[18]Ibid., p. 96.

[19]Leonhard Rost, Judaism Outside the Hebrew Canon: An Introduction to the Documents, trans. David E. Green (Nashville: Abingdon, 1976), p. 139.

in Enoch 6-11, 54-55:2, 60, 65-69:25, and 106-107.[20] This book thus forms the oldest pre-Maccabean portion of Enoch.

In the eighty-ninth and ninetieth chapters seventy periods of time are discussed that extend from Adam until the coming of the Messiah. The last period ends with the great horn in 90:9 which Charles interprets to be Judas Maccabaeus. "As this great horn is still warring at the close of the rule of the shepherds, 90:16, this section must have been written before the death of Judas, 161 B.C."[21] Thus, the fourth section (83-90) is dated just prior to 161 B.C. Also, Charles has observed that the part of the book of Noah that is preserved in the first section (6-36) is presupposed in the fourth section. Thus, Charles believes that the first section likewise must have been written before 161 B.C. Furthermore, Charles claims that since this section makes no reference to the persecution of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, this should be dated shortly before 170 B.C.[22]

Charles dates the third section (72-82) around 110 B.C. He claims that it cannot be later than this since this section is referred to in Jubilees 4:17,21, which Charles claims was written between 109 and 105 B.C. And the fifth section (91-104) is dated around 95-79 B.C. or 70-64 B.C. since the Maccabees are found to be allied with the Sadducees against the Pharisees. This must have been written after 109 B.C. when John Hyrcanus began to alienate the Maccabees from the Pharisees. The passage 103:14-15 speaks about the murder of the righteous by the rulers

---

[20] R. H. Charles, The Book of Enoch or I Enoch (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912), p. xlvii.

[21] Ibid., p. liii.

[22] Ibid., p. lii.

and Sadducees, thus Charles dates this after 95 B.C. when Alexander Jannaeus persecuted and slaughtered the Pharisees.[23]

And finally the second section (37-71), is likewise dated around 95-79 B.C. or 70-64 B.C. This is based upon the phrase in 38:5 "the Kings and the Mighty" which Charles interprets to refer to the

er Maccabean princes--but could not refer to the Herodians.[24]

Leonhard Rost agrees with Charles in his dating and adds that

> Nothing in the book makes any allusion to the coming of the Romans in 63 B.C.
>
> We may conclude . . . that the individual sections of the book came into being during the second and first centuries B.C. while the final redaction can be assigned to the end of this period.[25]

However, the discoveries at Qumran have cast some suspicion upon a pre-Christian date of the Similitudes (chapters 37-71). Fragments of I Enoch have been discovered in each of the five major sections of this book except in the Similitudes. Thus many scholars conclude that I Enoch existed without the Similitudes until after A.D. 70.[26]

However, C. C. Torrey does not agree with Charles. He claims that

> The book makes decidedly the impression of a late work, the time of the Maccabean struggle seems long past. The date of the main body of the work is provided in the vision of the bulls and sheep, chapters 85-90, which presents in figurative language the history of the Israelite world from Adam to the dawn of the Messianic Age.[27]

Torrey cites the "great horn" of 90:9 as being in the last time period

---

[23]Ibid., p. liii. Also see Josephus, Antiquities XIII. xiii. 5.

[24]Ibid., p. liv.

[25]Rost, Judaism Outside the Hebrew Canon, p. 139.

[26]Frank M. Cross, Jr., The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1958), p. 150. Also J. T. Milik, The Books of Enoch, p. 96.

[27]Torrey, The Apocryphal Literature, p. 112.

before the Messiah (like Charles) but Torrey claims that this horn is John Hyrcanus (135-105 B.C.) and not Judas Maccabaeus as Charles claims.[28] To support this interpretation Torrey notes that other horns preceeded the great horn, but Judas was preceeded only by his father Mattathias.

In the confusing section of 90:14-17 Torrey reconstructs the passage (which as it stands makes little sense) and claims that this is a reference to Alexander Jannaeus (102-76 B.C.) and his war against the Pharisees which occurred in 96 B.C.[29] At this point in time the Messiah was expected to come. Torrey concludes that "the book is thus to be dated in the first decade of the last century B.C., probably in or soon after the year 95. No part of the book appears to be earlier than this."[30] Moreover, Torrey rejects Charles' theory that Enoch contains portions of the lost Book of Noah.[31]

Concerning authorship, Charles makes the claim that all the books were probably written by the Chasidim or by the Pharisees.[32] However, Oesterley claims that while some portions of the book are undoubtedly Pharisaic, "it is not on that account necessary to ascribe all the later portions to the Pharisees."[33] Oesterley continues by noting some teachings that cannot be reconciled with a Pharisaic author. Rost goes so far as to claim that

---

[28]Ibid., p. 113.

[29]Ibid., pp. 113-14.

[30]Ibid., p. 114.

[31]Ibid., p. 112.

[32]W. O. E. Oesterley, "Introduction," The Book of Enoch, by R. H. Charles (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1917), p. xvi.

[33]Ibid., p. xviii.

> Jerusalem was probably the place where the individual sections were composed and the present book was assembled. . . . The group responsible for the book's composition exhibits marked similarities to the Qumran sect (calendar, angelology), but cannot be identified exactly with it.[34]

Thus, to sum up the findings on I Enoch, the majority of scholars would date the various sections of I Enoch somewhere within the first and second centuries B.C., although there is a good possibility that the Similitudes is a post-Christian addition. Also, most scholars would agree that I Enoch was written, at least in part, by a Pharisee, or by someone with similar beliefs (such as an Essene), although the later additions could have been written by another group.

Major Messianic sections include the following chapters:

10-11 Destruction of the Evil Angels and the Messianic Kingdom
38-39 The Judgment of the Messiah and the Dwelling-place of the Messiah
45-57 The Second Similitude with the Son of Man and the Elect One
58-71 The Third Similitude with the Son of Man and the Elect One
90-91 History up to the Coming of the Messiah and the Messianic Kingdom
105 God and the Messiah Unite with Men

The Book of Jubilees

Concerning the eschatological contents of the book, Davenport cites three major passages that are intended to teach eschatology (1:4b-26; 1:27-28, 29c; and 23:14-31).[35] In 1:4b-26 Moses received information concerning an eschatological apostasy and a return of the people. In 1:27-29 an angel was ordered to write the tables of the division of years from creation up to eternity. And in 23:14-31 an evil generation is discussed that precedes the Messianic age. Davenport

---

[34]Rost, Judaism Outside the Hebrew Canon, p. 139.

[35]Gene L. Davenport, The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees (Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1971), pp. 19-46.

also noted that several other passages contain significant eschatological elements (1:1-5, 5:1-19, 8:10-9:15, 15:1-34, 16:1-9, 22:11b-23, 24:8-33, 31:1-32, and 36:1-18).[36] However, the book contains little Messianic information. Reference to the Messiah is probably made only once in the book (31:18), but there are implications of a Messianic Kingdom in 1:29 and 23:14-31.

Theories concerning the date and authorship of the Book of Jubilees vary widely. These theories are mainly dependent upon historical allusions and other incidental artifacts that can be gleaned from the text. The fact that certain pieces of evidence seem to point in different directions complicates the problem and as a result the following theories must be considered as tentative.

The problem of the authorship draws many differing conclusions. R. H. Charles claims that it was written by a Pharisaic priest, but this conclusion has been convincingly rebutted by G. H. Box.[37] Box notes that there are too many positions in the book that are contrary to Pharisaic beliefs for it to have been written by a Pharisee (for example, the bodily resurrection is not accepted). Box further notes that various scholars have attributed the work to an Essene, a Samaritan, a Hellenist, and a Jewish Christian.[38] More recently however, Leonhard Rost has followed A. Jellinek's position by claiming that the author was an Essene. "This view must be accepted if the Qumran community is considered an

---

[36] Ibid., pp. 47-71.

[37] G. H. Box, "Introduction," The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis, by R. H. Charles (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1917), p. xxix.

[38] Ibid.

Essene monastic community, as seems most likely."[39] However, even he qualifies his theory by saying that "such a suggestion cannot be demonstrated, although there is much evidence in its favor."[40] Box concludes his investigation by saying that

> the author was undoubtedly a pious priest, a devoted adherent of the law, and an upholder of priestly tradition; he was certainly not a Pharisee, but has affinities with the Hasidim or "pious" of early Maccabean times; not improbably he was a Sadducean priest.[41]

The discussion concerning the date of Jubilees has likewise stirred a considerable controversy. The most popular theory is that advanced by R. H. Charles. He notes that in 32:1 Levi is called a "priest of the Most High God." Charles claims that this title was only used by the High Priests during the Maccabean period.[42] Thus, he concludes that this could not have been written earlier than 153 B.C. But Charles further narrows this date by interpreting the destruction of Shechem in 30:4-6 to be the destruction of Samaria by John Hyrcanus about four years before he died.[43] Thus, Charles concludes that the Book of Jubilees was written between 109 and 105 B.C.

C. C. Torrey, however, disagrees. He argues that the time of John Hyrcanus is not necessary and that a later date is much more plausible. He bases his dating upon the demonic names "Beliar" (1:20 and 15:33) and "Mastema" (10:8 et al.). These names, he claims, "belong to

---

[39] Rost, Judaism Outside the Hebrew Canon, p. 132.

[40] Ibid., p. 133.

[41] Box, The Book of Jubilees, p. xxxii.

[42] R. H. Charles, ed., The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English, II (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), 6.

[43] Ibid.

a late period in the history of the outside books."[44] These names are found in the Sibylline Oracles, the Ascension of Isaiah, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, and in the Lives of the Prophets--all works which date from the late first century B.C. or the first century A.D. Thus, Torrey claims that "The second half of the last century B.C. may be conjectured as the period within whose limits the composition of Jubilees is to be placed."[45]

Another interesting theory has been proposed by Gene Davenport, who claims that the Book of Jubilees was not written as one complete work. Instead, he claims that there were at least three authors of the book.[46] The main body of the book (from 2:1-50:4), Davenport claims was written in either the late third or the early second century B.C. He bases this date upon the supposition that nothing of the original discourse indicates that the struggles with the Seleucids have begun.[47] This of course, attributes the passage in 23:14-31 to another author--the editor of the second edition. Davenport claims that this editor also added 1:4-26 and the conclusion beginning with 50:5. This, he claims, was produced during the Maccabean struggles, around 166-160 B.C.[48] But then, a third editor added a bit more and wrote small portions at 1:27-29, 23:21, and 31:14. This finished our present edition around 140-104 B.C.[49]

---

[44]Torrey, The Apocryphal Literature, p. 128.

[45]Ibid.

[46]Davenport, The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees, pp. 10-17.

[47]Ibid., p. 14.

[48]Ibid., p. 15.

[49]Ibid., p. 16.

But perhaps the most convincing argument comes from James VanderKam who appeals to the manuscripts found at Qumran.[50] He appeals to some of the unpublished manuscript fragments and says that

> Cross has determined that the semi-cursive script in which 4Qm16Jub[a] and 4Qm17Jub[a] are written must date from ca. 125-75 B.C., with ±100 B.C. the preferred date. . . . consequently they are the oldest surviving portions of Jub.'s text. When one considers how unlikely it is that 4Qm16Jub[a] and 4Qm17Jub[a] are parts of the book's original manuscript, then a date before 100 B.C. for the book's composition becomes virtually assured.[51]

Furthermore, VanderKam says that "There appears to be a virtual consensus now, that Jub. contains covert references to Maccabean circumstances . . ."[52] Thus, he feels justified in dating the book of Jubilees between 161 and 140 B.C. and personally feels that between 161 and 152 B.C. is the most likely date in which it was written.[53]

Thus to conclude this section on Jubilees, the dating of the book, according to most scholars, falls in the mid or late second century B.C. The authorship of the book is greatly disputed and at best one can only guess that the author was an Essene or possibly a Sadducean. Messianic references in Jubilees are sparse, being limited to Jub. 1:29, 23:14-31, and 31:18. And even though eschatological allusions are found throughout the book, the larger eschatological sections are found in the following passages:

1:4-29 Moses Receives Eschatological Revelation from God, and an Angel Writes the Tables of the Divisions of Years--Creation to Eternity
5:10-18 The Day of Judgment

---

[50] James C. VanderKam, Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees, Harvard Semitic Monographs, No. 14 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977), pp. 214-85.

[51] Ibid., p. 216.

[52] Ibid.

[53] Ibid., pp. 283-84.

23:14-31 The Evil Generation Preceding the Messianic Kingdom

The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs

The problem of the date of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs centers around the question of whether the writing is a Jewish document with later Christian additions, as R. H. Charles, M. Rost, and A. Dupont-Sommer claim, or whether the writing is a Christian document based upon earlier Jewish traditions, as J. T. Milik and M. de Jonge claim. The position that has gathered the most support is that advanced by Charles, but recently de Jonge's theory has gained much support.

Charles bases his dating upon several passages in the Testaments which indicate that the original was written in the second century B.C. In the Testament of Reuben 6:10-11 reference is made to a priest who would be made king over all the people. Here Charles finds an allusion to the priest-kings of the Maccabean days.[54] Also in the Testament of Levi 8:14 the priests were to be called by a new name, which Charles associates with the title "Priests of the Most High God," a title that was first used by Maccabean high priests.[55] Charles then narrows the date down further by noticing that the offices of king, priest, and prophet are all centered in one individual in the Testament of Levi 8:14-15. The only person in all Jewish history to be given all three offices is John Hyrcanus.[56] Thus, Charles says that we may "conclude that the Testaments were written between 137 and 107," the dates of his

---

[54]Robert Henry Charles, The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1908), p. xliii.

[55]Ibid.

[56]Josephus, Antiquities XIII. x. 7.

reign.[57] To this, Charles claims that Jewish additions were made around 70-40 B.C. and then further additions were made by Christians as they adopted the Testaments.[58]

But Charles' theory has been criticized by M. de Jonge who claims that he has "proved that there is no textual basis for the removal of Christian interpolations.[59] Instead, de Jonge claims that the Testaments is a Christian work that is based upon earlier Jewish material. Originally he dated this work around 190-225 A.D. but he says "in 1957 I went back to the middle or second half of the second century A.D."[60] Otto Eissfeldt notes that de Jonge is supported in his theory by other scholars such as J. T. Milik and Millar Burrows.[61] They support de Jonge by claiming that that work is essentially a Christian writing, although it is based upon two earlier works--the Testament of Levi and the Testament of Naphtali, both of which have been found among the Qumran material.

Yet, even de Jonge's theory is not entirely accepted. For example, Rost claims that the parts may extend back to the second century B.C. "while a final Christian redaction can be dated around 200."[62] André Dupont-Sommer claims that the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs was written in its entirety in the Qumran community around 100 B.C. This is based upon his observation that the Damascus Document (written in the

---

[57]Charles, Greek Versions of the Testaments, p. xliii.

[58]Ibid., pp. xlvi, xlviii.

[59]M. de Jonge, ed., Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1975), p. 184.

[60]Ibid.

[61]Otto Eissfeldt, The Old Testament: An Introduction, trans. Peter R. Ackroyd (New York: Harper and Row Publ., 1965), p. 635.

[62]Rost, Judaism Outside the Hebrew Canon, p. 145.

first century B.C.) contains a number of parallels to all of the testaments except Issachar.[63] Thus, it appears evident that the final word on the date of the Testaments has not yet been said.

Concerning the authorship of the book the final word has likewise not yet been said. This discussion has been touched upon in the above paragraphs but even more options are available. Suggestions have included Pharisees, Sadducees, the Qumran community, and Christians, but as yet the evidence in support of these is lacking.

The main eschatological contents of the Testaments can be found in the Testaments of Levi, Judah and Naphtali. The Testament of Levi gives two visions: one of Heaven (2:1-5:7) and the other of Seven Men in White Raiment (8:1-18), along with a prophecy of the "new priest"--the Messiah (18:1-14). The Testament of Judah explains the troubles of the last days (21:6-22:3) and also speaks about the sins of Israel and the coming of the Messiah in the end times (23:1-25:5). The Testament of Naphtali contains a vision upon the Mount of Olives concerning Levi and Judah (5:1-7) and a vision of a ship in a storm (6:1-9) along with a prophecy of the last times (8:1-10). Messianic references can be found in several of the Testaments, such as the Testament of Judah (24) and the Testament of Levi (8 and 18) mentioned above. Also the Messiah is referred to in the Testament of Zebulun 9:5-9 (Zebulun's prophecy of his ancestors and the Messiah), the Testament of Reuben 6:5-12 (discussing a Messiah of Levi's seed), the Testament of Dan 5:4-13 (a prophecy of the last times) and the Testament of Joseph 19:1-12 (Joseph's vision of the twelve bulls). It is interesting to note that the Testaments give evidence

---

[63] A. Dupont-Sommer, The Essene Writings from Qumran, trans. G. Vermes (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1961), pp. 303-05.

for an expected Messiah not only from Judah, but also a Messiah from the tribe of Levi.

Thus, to sum up the findings on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, two positions are widely held today concerning the date and authorship of the Testaments. Those who follow Charles claim that the Testaments were written by Jews in the late second century B.C., but additions were incorporated in the first century B.C. and again later by the Christians. On the other hand, those who follow de Jonge claim that the Testaments were written by Christians in the second century A.D. while drawing upon earlier Jewish traditions. Concerning the Messianic contents of the Testaments, the following sections are the most prominent:

Test. Reuben 6:5-12 The Messiah of Levi's Seed
Test. Levi 8:1-18 The Seven Men in White Raiment
Test. Levi 18:1-14 The New Priest
Test. Judah 24:1-6 The Messiah of Judah's Seed
Test. Zebulun 9:5-9 Zebulun's Prophecy of His Ancestors
Test. Dan 5:4-13 Prophecy of the Last Times
Test. Joseph 19:1-12 Vision of the Twelve Bulls

The Sibylline Oracles

The Sibylline Oracles are a collection of fifteen books (twelve of which survive today) written over a long period of time. They are fashioned after the pagan Sibyls (women who in a state of ecstacy would predict the future) of Greece and Rome. The earliest of the Jewish Oracles seems to have been written sometime in the second century B.C. by a Jew living in Egypt. H. C. O. Lanchester said that "he took ancient Oracles and pieced them together, adding passages of his own which breathed strong monotheism and the glorification of the Jewish people."[64]

---

[64]H. C. O. Lanchester, "The Sibylline Oracles" The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, ed. R. H. Charles, II, 370.

The official pagan collection at Rome was destroyed in the burning of the temple in 82 B.C. But a group was soon despatched around the country and they brought back new copies. These also were later destroyed. But the Jewish collection had been steadily growing in Egypt since the middle of the second century. C. C. Torrey noted that "the Jews of Alexandria began at an early date to make skillful use of 'the Sibyl' for their propaganda."[65] Later "when the Jews had finished with their undertaking, the Christians took it up and carried it on until about the 6th century A.D."[66] Thus, the only books of any importance for this study are the third, fourth, and fifth books which were probably the core of the Jewish Oracles.

Opinions concerning the date and authorship are rather homogenous, with only slight differences of opinion. The third book is considered to be the oldest writing. Lanchester suggests that it could have been written as early as 168 B.C. or as late as 51 B.C., but he prefers the date of 96 B.C.[67] He also admits to possible later Christian interpolations. Torrey, however, opts for the middle of the second century B.C. and then dates the fourth and fifth books in the year A.D. 80 and in the second century A.D. respectively.[68] He claims that the latter two books both "appear to make use of the N.T. Revelation."[69] Eissfeldt supports this conclusion by claiming that in Book IV verses 130-136 probably refer to the eruption of Vesuvius in A.D. 79 and verses 137-139 probably refer

---

[65]Torrey, The Apocryphal Literature, p. 109.

[66]Ibid.

[67]Lanchester, "The Sibylline Oracles," p. 371.

[68]Torrey, The Apocryphal Literature, p. 109.

[69]Ibid.

to Nero.[70] Also in Book V verses 1-51 "carry us beyond Hadrian (117-138) and his three successors (138-180)."[71]

Since the Oracles were written over a long period of time, there can be no one author. Scholars generally see the present collection of Oracles as being the product of Jews and Christians (not to mention influences from pagan mythologies). However, the third, fourth, and fifth books were probably written by Diaspora Jews with no party affiliation. George Nickelsburg explained that

> Book 3 shows a remarkable openness to the Gentiles and may well have been written to be read by them. It employs Greek literary forms and draws on motifs from Greek mythology. More important, its attacks on Gentile idolatry and immorality are balanced by exhortations that the Gentiles repent of these evils in order to escape divine judgment and obtain the blessings of the one true God.[72]

Eissfeldt concluded that the third and fifth books "certainly came from Egypt" but concerning the fourth book "nothing can be determined about its place of origin."[73]

The third, fourth, and fifth books contain several eschatological passages. In the third book, lines 46-62 discuss the coming of the Kingdom of God and the Messiah. Lines 63-96 discuss the destruction of Beliar and the world. Lines 295-349 prophesy woes to the nations, and lines 652-812 are an extended discussion of the coming of the Messiah, the Messianic Kingdom, and the signs of the end. The major eschatological section in the fourth book is in lines 152 through 192. Here the prophecy

---

[70]Eissfeldt, The Old Testament, p. 616.

[71]Ibid., p. 617.

[72]George W. E. Nickelsburg, Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981), p. 165.

[73]Eissfeldt, The Old Testament, pp. 616-17.

centers on the eschatological end with reference to the destruction of the earth and the judgment. In the fifth book lines 260-285 proclaim the eschatological rise of Judaea, lines 344-385 explain the events of the last days, lines 403-433 discuss the blessed man with the sceptre, and lines 512-531 tell of the war of the stars.

Within these eschatological sections, the major Messianic references can be found in 3:46-62, 3:652-812, and 5:403-433. This, however, excludes some sections (such as 5:256-259) which appear to be later Christian interpolations.

Thus to conclude this section on the Sibylline Oracles, the dating of books three, four, and five probably fall within the second century B.C., the first century A.D., and the second century A.D. respectively. The authors were probably Diaspora Jews. And the major Messianic sections include the following passages:

3:46-62	The Coming of the Kingdom of God and the Messiah
3:652-812	The Coming of the Messiah, the Messianic Kingdom, and Signs of the End
5:403-33	The Blessed Man with the Sceptre

The Psalms of Solomon

Scholars today are almost universally agreed that the Psalms of Solomon were probably written in the first century B.C. There are several passages in these Psalms that would seem to point in that direction. G. Buchanan Gray claimed that

> the state of society reflected in these Psalms and the ideas that dominate them are entirely compatible with all that is known of the middle of the first century B.C., while the definite historical allusions, if these are rightly explained of Pompey's actions in Palestine and his death in Egypt (48 B.C.), show that it is the middle of the first century B.C. . . .[74]

---

[74]G. Buchanan Gray, "The Psalms of Solomon," The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, ed. R. H. Charles, II, 628.

Ryle and James claim that Pompey's capture of Jerusalem (around 63 B.C.) is the historical event directly alluded to in the first, second, eighth, and seventeenth (the first twenty-two verses) Psalms.[75] Also indirect allusions to this period of time can be found in the fifth, seventh, ninth, and fifteenth Psalms.[76] And C. C. Torrey likewise affirms this conclusion saying that 2:1, 8:18-24, and 17:14 all point to Pompey. He also points to 2:30ff, as a passage that indicates his death. "This was actually Pompey's fate, in 48 B.C., and the Psalm must have been written very soon after that date."[77]

The question of authorship, however, is not as easy a task. It used to be the consensus opinion of scholars that the book was written by a single Pharisee or a group of Pharisees. This conclusion was based upon a conflict seen in the Psalms between the sinners (the Sadducees) and the righteous (the Pharisees). Gray claimed that

> we need not hesitate to see in the 'righteous' of the Psalms the Pharisees, and in the 'sinners' the Sadducees (4:2ff.); and in the Psalms themselves the work of one or more of the Pharisees. It is the Pharisaic piety that breathes through the Psalms.[78]

But this opinion has recently come under some criticism. John Oswalt claimed that these arguments

> prove only that the authorship was not Sadducee, for these doctrines were by no means the exclusive possession of the Pharisees. They belonged as well to that third, rather amorphous, group, of which the Qumran community was an extreme example, and which may be called

---

[75]Herbert Edward Ryle and Montague Rhodes James, Psalms of the Pharisees: Commonly Called the Psalms of Solomon (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1891), p. xxxviii.

[76]Ibid.

[77]Torrey, The Apocryphal Literature, pp. 109-10.

[78]Gray, "The Psalms of Solomon," p. 630.

the "eschatological" Jews.[79]

Eissfeldt made the same point when he said:

> although it is true that Pss. Sol. 2, 8, and 17 reflect the same position which was taken up by the Pharisees towards the political events of that period, the attitude of the other Psalms cannot be regarded as characteristic of that one group alone, . . . We have rather a type of piety which may be demonstrated everywhere, expressed here in positive and negative terms. Pharisaism was certainly of this kind, but not Pharisaism alone.[80]

Thus, the most satisfactory position on the authorship of the Psalms of Solomon seems to be that it was written by someone with no particular party affiliation.

The Psalms of Solomon can hardly be considered an apocalyptic work, but it is nevertheless included in this study because it does contribute some significant eschatological data. Psalms seventeen and eighteen give indications of the popular expectations of the Messiah during this time period. The seventeenth Psalm, verses 23-51, discusses the Messiah's coming, his earthly reign, the Jewish deliverance from the Gentile nations, and the subjugation of the heathen people. The eighteenth Psalm is a short Psalm extolling the goodness of God, and mentioning the day of the coming Anointed One.

The Assumption of Moses

The Assumption of Moses exists in only one ancient manuscript, a sixth century Latin translation, of which the ending is missing. The book contains the discourses of Moses to his successor Joshua, and is set in the framework of prophesied future events. Moses claims that they

---

[79]John Oswalt "Psalms of Solomon," The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible, ed. Merrill C. Tenney (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publ. House, 1976) IV, 948.

[80]Eissfeldt, The Old Testament, pp. 612-13.

will come to possess the land and then will be ruled over by their kings. Later they will be divided and then they will be subjugated and taken into exile. Two of the tribes are restored and the brief historical account is brought up to the reign of Herod. At this time, the writer evidently considered the day of the Lord to be at hand. In 7:1 the author wrote "and after this the times shall be finished, in a moment shall follow the second course." From this point the book predicts the future events of the Jewish people. God will arise and will punish the adversaries of Israel. "His Kingdom shall appear through His whole creation. And then the devil shall have an end" (10:1). Finally God will exalt Israel and bring it "to the heaven of the stars, the place of His habitation" (10:19). After this, Joshua is comforted and encouraged by Moses. At this point the manuscript ends. The Assumption makes no explicit reference to the Messiah. Thus, R. H. Charles claims that the author does not believe in the traditional conception of the Messiah.[81] Instead, the kingdom was to be ushered in by the vicarious sufferings of the tribes for one another (3:5). However, Charles may be a little hasty in this judgment since an argument from silence cannot be carried too far. On the other hand, "the day of repentence" and the visitation of the Lord in 1:18 could be an implicit reference to the Messiah.

Because of the many historical allusions in the book there is little question about the date of the work. In 6:6-7 the text reads: "and he shall execute judgment upon them, as did the Egyptians, for thirty and four years, and shall punish them and he shall beget sons that shall succeed him and reign for shorter periods." The historical narratives bring the history through the Maccabean period and the ruler

---

[81]R. H. Charles, "The Assumption of Moses," The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, ed. R. H. Charles, II, 412.

for thirty-four years appears to be Herod the Great who reigned for thirty-four years, before dying in 4 B.C. However the seventh verse seems to be in error, since two of his sons did not "reign for shorter periods." Philip reigned for thirty-seven years and Antipas ruled for forty-three years. Thus, it is assumed that this book was written shortly after Herod's death in 4 B.C. but not later than A.D. 30. Charles, however, claims that this can be further reduced to A.D. 7-30, since he believes that the deposition of one of Herod's sons (Archelaus) in A.D. 6 encouraged the author to write verse seven.[82]

The authorship of the book has become a rather debatable issue. It is obvious from the book that the writer is a Jew. R. H. Charles calls him a "Pharisaic Quietist" and claims that he could not have been either a Sadducee, Zealot, or an Essene.[83] Leonhard Rost, however, claims that the discoveries at Qumran and the Assumption of Moses' affinity with some of these writings may indicate that the author was an Essene.[84] But Martin Rist claims that "his interest in the temple is enough to preclude his having been an Essene" and "his apocalypticism" seems to indicate that he was not a Pharisee.[85] Instead, he concludes that "he was an apocalyptic Jew who may have had no affiliation with any formal group."[86] However, Rist fails to note that there is conflicting

---

[82]Ibid., p. 411.

[83]Ibid.

[84]Rost, Judaism Outside the Hebrew Canon, p. 148.

[85]Martin Rist, "Assumption of Moses," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, ed. George Arthur Buttrick (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), III, 451.

[86]Ibid.

evidence concerning Essene attitudes toward the temple[87] and he apparently assumes that apocalypticism had died out in the Pharisaism of the early first century A.D. Thus, neither the Essenes nor the Pharisees can be so easily dismissed. Nevertheless, Rist's conclusion that the author was an apocalyptic Jew with no group affiliation may be correct since the doctrines of no one group stand out in the writing.

Thus, it appears that the Assumption of Moses was written sometime between A.D. 7-30 by an unknown Jew, of whom it is difficult to determine any relation to a Jewish party. Explicit Messianic references are lacking in the book, but eschatology is prominent in the following passages:

7:1-8:5	The Final Course: Events following Herod the Great; The Visitation of Wrath
9:1-7	Taxo and His Seven Sons--From Levi
10:1-15	The Coming of the Kingdom, Cosmic Cataclysms, and the Exaltation of Israel

II Enoch or Slavonic Enoch

The book of II Enoch exists in two different versions: a long form and a short form, both of which are written in Slavonic. But, it is known that these versions were translated from a Greek manuscript, which in turn possibly could go back to an original Hebrew.

The book has traditionally been dated in the first half of the first century A.D., but recently some scholars have advocated a date much later. R. H. Charles claims that several passages in II Enoch are

---

[87]Marcel Simon, Jewish Sects at the Time of Jesus, trans. James H. Farley (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), p. 74 notes that passages in Philo (Every Good Man 12:75) and Josephus (Antiquities XVIII. i. 5) seem to indicate different Essene positions toward the temple. Simon commented that "Perhaps we should assume that on this point . . . the attitude of the Essenes varied from time to time and from place to place."

quoted by the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (a work from the late second century B.C. with Jewish additions made in the mid first century B.C.). Thus he concludes that part of the work must be pre-Christian and was probably originally written in Hebrew.[88] But, since the work seems to depend upon passages from Sirach and I Enoch (both from the early second century B.C.) and the Book of Wisdom (from the late first century B.C.), Charles thinks that a second edition was issued somewhere between 30 B.C. and A.D. 70.[89] The date of A.D. 70 seems to be the latest that the book could have been written since several passages in the book seem to indicate that the temple was still standing (59:1-2, 61:4-62:2, and 66:2). Thus, Charles prefers a date between A.D. 1-50.

More recently, however, this date has come under some criticism. J. T. Milik noted that no trace of the book can be found in early Christian literature and said that "J. K. Fotheringham proved conclusively that the terminus post quem of the work was the middle of the seventh century."[90] Milik then comes to the conclusion that "A lexical argument irrefutably confirms, in my opinion, the dating of the Slavonic Enoch to the ninth to tenth centuries."[91] However, Milik's date has not gained much support and thus it seems best to follow Eissfeldt and Rost who claim that II Enoch "should probably be dated in the first half of the first century C.E." Although "Its final form is due to a Christian

---

[88] R. H. Charles, "The Book of the Secrets of Enoch," The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, ed. R. H. Charles, II, 428-29.

[89] Ibid., p. 429.

[90] J. T. Milik, The Books of Enoch, p. 109.

[91] Ibid., p. 110.

revision in the Eastern Church dating from the seventh century."[92]

Concerning the authorship of the work, Charles claimed that Platonic (30:16), Egyptian (25:2), and Zoroastrian (58:4-6) influences can be found. Thus, Charles claimed that this was written by a devout Jew of the diaspora, "who lived in Egypt, probably in Alexandria."[93] With this conclusion, Rost is in agreement.[94] But, Milik suggested that the author was a monk from Studios, in the ninth or tenth century.[95] However, if the original writing does go back to a first century edition, as it seems likely, Charles' suggestion of a diaspora Jew seems most probable.

Concerning the contents of the book, II Enoch tells the story of Enoch's ascension into heaven and his travels through the ten heavens (chapters 3-37). Here Enoch is given revelations concerning the creation of the world and the duration of the world (7000 years with another one thousand year period at the end--33:1). Enoch is then commanded to return to the earth and to teach his sons for a period of thirty days (36:1-2). What follows then is Enoch's apocalyptic discourse to his sons. He tells of the future of men's souls and tells of the horrors of hell and the coming day of judgment (chapters 39-48). Enoch then ends the discourse with an exhortation (chapters 49-66) and immediately he is again transported to the highest heaven (chapter 67). There are no apparent references to the Messiah in this book, and the eschatology of

---

[92]Rost, Judaism Outside the Hebrew Canon, p. 112. Also see Eissfeldt, The Old Testament, p. 623.

[93]R. H. Charles, "The Book of the Secrets of Enoch," p. 429.

[94]Rost, Judaism Outside the Hebrew Canon, p. 112.

[95]Milik, The Books of Enoch, p. 112.

II Enoch is vague and is very general in nature. For example, the day of judgment is a major theme in II Enoch, but few details are given of that day.

The Ascension of Isaiah

Scholars today generally concede that the Ascension of Isaiah is a redacted collection of three earlier works. The first is called the Martyrdom of Isaiah and generally includes 1:1-3:12 and 5:2-14. The second, called the Testament of Hezekiah, is considered to be a Christian insertion and extends from 3:13 to 4:18. The third is called the Vision of Isaiah and this includes the latter portion from 6:1 to 11:40. Of course redactions are found interspersed throughout the work, especially at the beginning and end, as well as at the points of connection.

R. H. Charles noted that several of the early church fathers quote from the Martyrdom of Isaiah and he claimed that Hebrews 11:37 could be an allusion to this writing. Thus, he claims that this section should be dated in the first century A.D., or at the latest in the early second century.[96]

The second section, the Testament of Hezekiah, is dated by Charles from 88 to 100 A.D.[97] This is based upon his interpretation of verses 4:13-14. Here Charles claimed that there is a distinction made between those who have seen Jesus and those who have not. Thus, this period of time is considered to be when only a few of those who had

---

[96]R. H. Charles, The Ascension of Isaiah (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1900), p. xliv.

[97]Ibid., pp. 30-31.

personally seen Jesus remained alive (around A.D. 90-100).[98] Also in this section Charles claimed that there seems to be reference to Nero as being the antichrist.[99] This is drawn from 4:1-3 where reference is made to a ruler ("Beliar, in the likeness of a man") who kills his mother, persecutes the church, and kills one of the twelve apostles.

The third section, the Vision of Isaiah, Charles dates to the close of the first century.[100] But Martin Rist sees several Gnostic elements in this and thus prefers to date it in the late second century.[101] However, Andrew Helmbold has observed that "These Gnostic elements can now be dated earlier because certain Nag Hammadi texts attest their prevalence in the first half of the century."[102]

Thus, scholars generally agree with Charles' dating of the documents including his estimate of a final redaction around the second or early third century.[103] But not all scholars are even in agreement with the fragmentary character of the book. F. C. Burkitt complained about his fellow scholars who "use the wooden saw to dissect the Ascension of Isaiah."[104] He prefered to

> treat it as a unity and as the work of a Christian throughout. Of course, I do not mean to deny that some details in the fanciful story

---

[98]Ibid., p. 31.

[99]Ibid., pp. 25-26.

[100]Ibid., p. xiv.

[101]Martin Rist, "Ascension of Isaiah," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, II, 745.

[102]Andrew K. Helmbold, "Ascension of Isaiah," Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible, I, 349.

[103]Charles, The Ascension of Isaiah, p. xlv.

[104]F. Crawford Burkitt, Jewish and Christian Apocalypses (London: British Academy, 1914), p. 45.

> of Isaiah's martyrdom may have been ultimately derived from Jewish sources.[105]

As a result, Burkitt claimed that the entire work was written in the early years of the second century--based upon the probable reference to Nero. He is supported in this claim by C. C. Torrey who likewise claimed that the work is entirely Christian. Torrey objects to Charles' fragmentizing of the book saying that "it seems quite evident that the attempt to sift out the fragments of a Jewish document must be fruitless."[106] Thus, even though it is difficult to come to a conclusion concerning the precise Jewish-Christian nature of the work, most scholars agree with Charles' three sources and date the various works in the early second century A.D. or earlier.

The authorship of the book has been dealt with in part in the above discussion. Generally speaking, most scholars believe that there is a Jewish book (1:1-3:12 and 5:2-14) to which Christian additions have been made. But others, such as Burkitt and Torrey claim that the book is entirely Christian. Yet, even Burkitt and Torrey concede that Jewish traditions may lie at the base of the present work. Of those who uphold the Jewish section, few attempt to speculate upon any party affiliations, since the section is rather brief and contains few clues as to its authorship.

Concerning the eschatological contents of the book, these seem to be concentrated in the two Christian sections (3:13-4:18) and (6:1-11:40). However, the Jewish work (1:1-3:12 and 5:2-14) does contain a few references to the Messiah, the judgment, and the destruction of the world

---

[105] Ibid.

[106] Torrey, The Apocryphal Literature, p. 134.

(especially 1:3-6). But Charles claims that the references to the Messiah (or "The Beloved") in 1:4,5,7, and 13 are additions by the final Christian editor.[107] The Testament of Hezekiah (3:13-4:18) reports Isaiah's vision of the coming Messiah, the apostasy of the final days, Beliar--the lawless king who persecutes the church, and the second coming of Christ. The Vision of Isaiah (6:1-11:40) discusses Isaiah's ascent through the stages of heaven to meet God in the seventh heaven and contains a "prophecy" of Christ's life. However, the Testament of Hezekiah and the Vision of Isaiah are Christian writings.

II Esdras or IV Ezra

The names II Esdras and IV Ezra are commonly used synonymously but strictly speaking II Esdras should refer to the work in its entirety while IV Ezra should refer to the apocalypse of chapters 3-14. It is commonly recognized that the first and second chapters as well as the last two (15 and 16) are later additions.

The first two chapters were probably added sometime in the second century since there seems to be several quotations and allusions to the Christian canonical writings and also a possible reference to the Apocalypse of Baruch.[108] The last two chapters are dated between A.D. 240-270, and seem to be a late Christian addition.

The main body of the work is chapters 3-14. There is some debate as to whether this section is basically a unity, written by an author

---

[107] R. H. Charles, The Ascension of Isaiah, intro. by G. H. Box, Translations of Early Documents (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1919), p. xix and p. 29. G. H. Box notes that "There are good grounds, as Dr. Armitage Robinson has shown, for believing that this title is pre-Christian." Ibid., p. xix.

[108] Oesterley, Introduction, pp. 146-47.

drawing upon earlier materials or whether it is the work of a final redactor who combined four works into the present book. Scholars such as Rost, Eissfeldt, and Bruce Metzger take the former position and claim that the author was a Jew who wrote the book around the end of the first century.[109] His apocalyptic frame of mind was influenced by the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70.

The other position is that the work is a redaction of several separate books. Earlier authors such as Richard Kabisch and G. H. Box[110] completely fragmentize the work and attempt to reconstruct the originals from the pieces, but scholars who follow this theory today generally accept the following four divisions.

Chapters three through ten are commonly called the Salathiel Apocalypse. This section can be dated from 3:1 which says "In the thirtieth year of the fall of our city I, Salathiel, who am Ezra, was in Babylon." Since the work is obviously a pseudonym this is taken to be a veiled reference to the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. Thus this work can be dated around A.D. 100.

The second section which includes the eleventh and twelfth chapters is called the Eagle Vision. The dating of this book is provided by the elements of the Vision which represent the Roman empire. The wings of the eagle probably represent emperors, but problems of interpretation arise when one begins to realize that extra wings and even heads are added throughout the text (11:1,11; 12:14,19). C. C. Torrey claims that

---

[109]Rost, Judaism Outside the Hebrew Canon, p. 124, Eissfeldt, The Old Testament, p. 626-27, and Bruce M. Metzger, An Introduction to the Apocrypha (New York: Oxford University Press, 1957), p. 22.

[110]G. H. Box, "IV Ezra," The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, ed. R. H. Charles, II, 549-52. Here Box refers to Kabisch, Das vierte Buch Esra und seine Quellen untersucht (1889).

these extra wings and heads were later additions to the apocalypse by the author and redactor in order to update the prophecy.[111] The original writing probably included only eight wings, and since 11:32 most likely refers to Nero, the eighth wing would have ended with Otho who took office in A.D. 69 and then later died in the same year. Thus this work can probably be dated in this year before the death of Otho. This is also supported by the fact that this section makes no mention of the destruction of Jerusalem that soon followed.

The third section, the Man from the Sea, includes the thirteenth chapter. Oesterley following G. H. Box, dates this part before A.D. 70 and prefers a date around A.D. 66.[112] This is based upon 13:38-40 which implies Israel's peaceful existence prior to A.D. 70.[113]

The final section, which includes the fourteenth chapter is dated somewhere between A.D. 100 and 120 by Oesterley[114] and others, although the reasoning for this date leaves them open to criticism. The content of the chapter discusses the formation of Jewish scriptures by Ezra. Thus, it is claimed that this section was written when the Jews were discussing the question of the canon.

Whether there were originally four (or more) sources contributing to the present IV Ezra is a question that cannot be easily answered. Perhaps scholars will always debate the question. But, what scholars can agree upon is that the work can be dated around the turn of the first

---

[111] Torrey, The Apocryphal Literature, p. 120.

[112] Oesterley, Introduction, p. 155.

[113] Ibid.

[114] Ibid.

century A.D. (or the parts anywhere between A.D. 66-120).

As far as the authorship of the book is concerned it is generally recognized as being the work of a Jew (or if the work is a composite--Jews). This excludes of course, the two sections which begin and end the book, which are considered to be later Christian additions to an otherwise Jewish book. To determine a particular Jewish party represented in chapters 3-14 is difficult to do. This is particularly so if the work was written by a number of Jews at different times. Otto Eissfeldt (who considers this section to be a unity) simply states that "we do not know who the author was."[115] There do not appear to be enough hints to draw a solid conclusion.

The eschatological contents of the book are confined to the earlier work, chapters 3-14. The section includes seven visions which are given to Ezra. The first four visions are included in the Salathiel Apocalypse and they speak about the suffering of this world, injustices, and the approaching end of this world. The fifth vision is the Eagle Vision and this gives a picture of the political situation at the end time. The sixth vision (a man from the sea) probably refers to the Messiah. And the seventh is the record of when Ezra supposedly dictated the 24 canonical books along with the 70 secret writings. The major eschatological sections in these visions follow:

4:26-5:13	The Coming of the New Age and the Signs Preceding the Time of the End
6:11-34	Signs of the End of the Age
7:26-44	Revelation of the Messiah, the Resurrection, and the Day of Judgment
8:63-9:12	Signs of the End Times
10:60-12:39	The Vision of the Eagle (Daniel's Fourth Kingdom) and the Lion (the Messiah)
13:1-53	The Vision of the Man from the Stormy Sea--the Messiah

---

[115]Eissfeldt, The Old Testament, p. 627.

Messianic implications run throughout these visions but explicit references to the Messiah are found in the eschatological sections of chapters seven, eleven, twelve, and thirteen.

II Baruch or the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch

The Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch must be distinguished from the Greek Apocalypse of Baruch, which is another apocalypse entirely. Nevertheless, the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch probably came from an earlier Greek Apocalypse of the same name which is now lost. This Greek copy in turn was probably a translation from an original Hebrew or Aramaic exemplar.

Scholars beginning with Richard Kabisch have considered the book to be a composite and have attempted to divide the work into its component sources.[116] R. H. Charles expanded Kabisch's earlier attempt and concludes that the apocalypse was actually derived from six different sources.[117] These elements he dates in the latter half of the first century A.D., some before the destruction of Jerusalem and others after this date. Oesterley claims that composite authorship is contended on the grounds of "irreconcilable, or at least conflicting, views regarding the Messiah and the Messianic Kingdom, opposing attitudes in respect of various important theological subjects," contrasting optimism and pessimism, and "the treatment of the same subject more than once without any apparent reason."[118]

However, all scholars are not convinced of multiple authorship.

---

[116]Richard Kabisch, Fahrbücher für protestantische Theologie (1891), pp. 66-107 cited by R. H. Charles, "II Baruch," The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, ed. R. H. Charles, II, 474.

[117]R. H. Charles, "II Baruch," The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, ed. R. H. Charles, II, 474-76.

[118]W. O. E. Oesterley, intro., The Apocalypse of Baruch, by R. H. Charles (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1917), p. x.

F. C. Burkitt agrees that there must be a certain amount of consistency in order for a work to be considered a unity. But when dealing with apocalyptic writings and visions, consistency should not be pressed too far. "Pictures of the future will not always harmonize in detail. Moreover, I venture to think that we must allow for the disturbing influence of real visions, i.e. pictures seen by the writer in dream or ecstasy."[119] On this basis Burkitt regards the present book to be the work of a single author.[120] Most scholars today seem to support its unity.

The main question today would probably be centered around the relationship between the Apocalypse of Baruch and IV Ezra. Both works contain many allusions and quotations from the other, but the question remains: which work borrowed from the other? In briefly summing up the matter, we can quote Leonhard Rost and say that "At the present, the scales are tipped in favor of an earlier origin for IV Ezra."[121] IV Ezra, of course, is a work whose composition has been hotly debated, although most scholars agree that the range of dates for the book fall around the turn of the first century A.D. (anywhere from A.D. 66-120).[122]

The dating of the Apocalypse of Baruch is generally agreed upon today. This is based mostly upon 32:2-4, where it appears apparent that the fall of Jerusalem has past. This places the work sometime after A.D. 70, but probably not too long after this date since no allusion to the Bar Kochba revolt can be found. This date also corresponds with the

---

[119] Burkitt, Jewish and Christian Apocalypses, p. 40.

[120] Ibid., p. 41.

[121] Rost, Judaism Outside the Hebrew Canon, p. 129.

[122] See "II Esdras or IV Ezra" above.

affinities found with IV Ezra. Furthermore, Charles finds a number of parallel passages with the New Testament writings,[123] although, many of these passages probably allude to Old Testament works or other sources.

Concerning the authorship of the Apocalypse of Baruch, scholars are agreed upon the Pharisaic authorship of the book. Martin Rist reported that "The work is quite Jewish, as the Talmudic parallels cited by Ginzberg show. The stress placed upon the law and the keeping of the law indicates that the author had much in common with the Pharisees."[124]

Of the eighty-seven chapters of II Baruch, the eschatological portions of the book constitute a major section of the book roughly stretching from chapter 24 to chapter 74. The following are the major eschatological passages of the book:

24:1-25:4	The Day of Judgment and the Signs of Its Coming
26:1-29:8	The Twelve Part Tribulation, the Revelation of the Messiah, and the Messianic Kingdom
30:1-5	The Resurrection
36:1-40:4	The Vision of the Forest, Vine, Fountain, and Cedar.
49:1-52:7	The Resurrection of the Righteous and Wicked
53:1-74:4	The Vision of the Cloud with Black and White Waters--History from Adam to the Messiah

The Messiah is mentioned often in these sections. In 29:3 and 39:7 the Messiah is considered to be the climax of the things to come. Upon his arrival the Resurrection will occur (30:1-2). The Messiah is also pictured in the judgment (40:1) and is included in the latter parts of the historical survey of the vision of the cloud with black and white waters (70-74).

---

[123] Charles, "II Baruch," pp. 479-80.

[124] Martin Rist, "Baruch, Apocalypse of," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, I, 362.

Table 1

The Date, Authorship, and Eschatological Contents of the Apocalyptic Writings

Book	Date	Author	Eschatological Contents
I Enoch			
1-36	Before 170 BC	Pharisee?	10-11, 38-39, 45-57,
37-71	95-79 BC, 70-64 BC, or after AD70	Pharisee?	58-71, 90-91, 105
72-82	111 BC	Pharisee?	
83-90	Before 161 BC	Pharisee?	
91-108	95-79 BC, or 70-64 BC	Pharisee?	
Jubilees	160-100 BC	Essene?	1:4-29, 5:10-18, 23:14-31
Test. XII	130 BC or AD 150	Unknown Jew or Christian	Reuben 6:5-12, Levi 8:1-18, 18:1-14, Judah 24:1-6, Zebulun 9:5-9, Dan 5:4-13, Joseph 19:1-12
Sib. Or.			
III	150 BC	Diaspora Jew	3:46-62
IV	AD 80	Diaspora Jew	3:652-812
V	AD 150	Diaspora Jew	5:403-33
Ps. Sol.	After 48 BC	Pharisee?	17:23-51, 18:1-14
Ass. Moses	AD 7-30	Unknown Jew	7:1-8:5, 9:1-7, 10:1-15
II Enoch	AD 1-50	Diaspora Jew	39-48, 67
Asc. Is.			
Martyr. Is.	AD 90	Unknown Jew	1:1-3:12, 3:13-4:18,
Test. Hez.	AD 88-100	Christian	5:2-14, 6:1-11:40
Vision Is.	AD 100	Christian	
IV Ezra	AD 100	Unknown Jew	4:26-5:13, 6:11-34, 7:26-44, 8:63-9:12, 10:60-12:39, 13:1-53
II Baruch	After AD 70	Pharisee	24:1-25:4, 26:1-29:8, 30:1-5, 36:1-40:4, 49:1-52:7, 53:1-74:4

Chapter 4

INFLUENCES UPON THE APOCALYPTIC WRITERS

The influences upon the apocalyptic writers is a topic that has received a considerable amount of discussion in recent years. Generally speaking, there are two schools of thought on the issue with a spectrum of positions in between. The one school is exemplified by Hans Dieter Betz who said "Jewish and, subsequently, Christian apocalypticism as well cannot be understood from themselves or from the Old Testament alone, but must be seen and presented as peculiar expressions within the entire development of Hellenistic syncretism."[1] For Betz, the essential fabric of apocalypticism was not Jewish but was borrowed from foreign religions. The primary influence came from the Persian religion Zoroastrianism, but other elements have been detected that came from Babylon and the Greeks. However, Betz is opposed at the other end of the spectrum by Paul D. Hanson who asserts that "The apocalyptic literature of the second century and after is the result of a long development reaching back to pre-exilic times and beyond, and not the new baby of second-century foreign parents."[2] At this point it seems necessary to examine these positions and to investigate the bases upon which they rest.

---

[1] Hanz Dieter Betz, "On the Problem of the Religio-Historical Understanding of Apocalypticism," Apocalypticism, ed. Robert W. Funk, Journal for Theology and the Church, No. 6 (New York: Herder and Herder, 1969), p. 155.

[2] Paul D. Hanson, The Dawn of Apocalyptic (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), p. 6.

Foreign Influence

In the past, this position held the majority support for scholars. It was an accepted position that the Jewish apocalyptic writers had either purposely or unconsciously incorporated concepts from foreign religions, particularly Zoroastrianism. The ancient Near Eastern culture was thoroughly enmeshed in the religious syncretism begun by Alexander and continued by his successors. Judaism could hardly have escaped from the great influx of religious ideas. Persian thought was particularly tempting and ideas such as angelology and dualism were quickly added. It is only recently that this position has been seriously challenged.

H. H. Rowley said that

> An earlier generation emphasized the predictive element in prophecy, and the relation between prophecy and apocalyptic, in which the predictive element is particularly prominent, appeared beyond question. In modern times the prophets have been seen rather in the background of their own age as preachers of righteousness and godliness, and the link with the apocalypticists has seemed less close. . . . modern study has emphasized their moral and spiritual message far less than in the case of the prophets.[3]

The apocalypticists have been seen as writers who abandoned all hope in the present age and who were writing for the benefit of future generations.

Gerhard von Rad addressed the question in his Old Testament Theology saying:

> it might seem appropriate to understand apocalyptic literature as a child of prophecy. To my mind, however, this is completely out of the question. In this connexion, too much importance should not be given to the fact that apocalyptic literature never understands itself as prophecy, and that it sometimes speaks of prophecy as ended

---

[3]H. H. Rowley, The Relevance of Apocalyptic (New York: Association Press, 1964), p. 15.

> ("the prophets have fallen asleep," Syr. Baruch 85:3). The decisive factor, as I see it, is the incompatibility between apocalyptic literature's view of history and that of the prophets.[4]

It is noted that the prophets understood the present salvation of God to be rooted in the activity of God in Israel's past. The apocalyptic writers however, were not concerned with the events of the past. They were just about to enter into the last days and the past was relatively unimportant. Because of their lack of concern for history von Rad also observes a difference in the use of history when it is found in the prophets and the apocalypticists. He claims that the prophets dealt with "isolated events in history, whereas apocalyptic literature tries to take the whole historical process together and objectify it conceptually."[5] In this process, progressive history is seen by the apocalypticists to get progressively worse.

To further support this view, von Rad observes that the prophets were "open" in their predictions. While in contrast "the apocalyptic writers veiled their own standpoint in time."[6] The pseudepigraphal character of the apocalyptic literature stands in marked contrast to the writings of the prophets. Thus, von Rad concludes that the sources of the apocalyptic writings must be found outside of prophetic Judaism. Instead he prefers to see the origin of apocalyptic literature in Old Testament and foreign wisdom literature.[7]

Likewise, Hans Dieter Betz looks for the origin of apocalyptic

---

[4]Gerhard von Rad, Old Testament Theology, trans. D. M. G. Stalker (New York: Harper and Row Publ., 1965), p. 303.

[5]Ibid., p. 304.

[6]Ibid., p. 305.

[7]Ibid., pp. 306-08.

outside of Old Testament prophecy. He claimed that extra-Jewish influences must be assumed for the differences in apocalyptic and prophetic writings. These new ideas coupled with the new and distressing historical background "caused and determined the specifically apocalyptic transformation of the older material."[8] Betz does not disclaim any connection between the prophets and the apocalypticists. But, the original Jewish core has been radically changed by the new material. "Under the compelling force of new underlying questions, indeed, the older material was transmuted and recast so that it became something entirely different and new. It is quite clear that this is an indication of a discontinuity."[9] In particular this transmutation has resulted in the development of dualism, angelology, cosmology, and astrology in the apocalyptic literature.[10]

Appeal is most often made to the Persian religion, Zoroastrianism, for the origins of these doctrines. W. O. E. Oesterley said that "this influence was brought to bear owing to the close contact of the Jews with Babylonian-Persian beliefs during the exile, and after, and doubtless also during the earlier part of the Greek period."[11] Oesterley claims that these influences did not appear in the Jewish literature soon after the exile because of the suppression imposed upon it by the Jewish religious leaders.[12] Their main interest with the Torah and with instructing the people to follow the Law excluded the speculative and

---

[8]Betz, p. 137.

[9]Ibid., pp. 137-38.

[10]Ibid., p. 138.

[11]W. O. E. Oesterley, The Jews and Judaism During the Greek Period: The Background of Christianity (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1941), pp. 90-91.

[12]Ibid., p. 91.

eschatological ideas of foreign thought. But gradually through the depressing years that followed, the foreign elements gained a hearing in the Jewish community. Apocalyptic thus, could offer a renewed hope and dependence upon the God of Israel. The result was a "bewildering intermingling of traditional beliefs with extraneous elements, the latter often predominating."[13]

D. S. Russell similarly explains the presence of foreign elements that have crept into the Jewish religion. The syncretism of the day had allowed religious ideas to permeate the entire near eastern culture. Jews in Palestine and especially those who were in the diaspora came into contact with these ideas. Speaking of those in the dispersion Russell says: "From time to time they would return to Palestine bringing back with them an appreciation of those aspects of Hellenism which were not altogether out of harmony with their own Hebrew religion."[14]

> This helps to explain the rather strange fact that, although the apocalyptic writings are on the side of "the pious ones" in Israel and are opposed to those members of the priestly aristocracy who readily embraced the Hellenistic way of life, they nevertheless contain elements which clearly show the influence of alien thought, particularly that of Greece and Persia.[15]

Russell, however, maintains a rather "middle ground" position concerning the origin of apocalyptic teachings. He notes that it can hardly be denied that Persian and Babylonian religions have contributed many ideas to these writings.[16] Yet, he also claims that "the tap root,

---

[13]Ibid., p. 128.

[14]D. S. Russell, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964), p. 19.

[15]Ibid., pp. 19-20.

[16]Ibid., pp. 18-19.

as it were, went deep down into Hebrew prophecy, and in particular the writings of the post-exilic prophets whose thought and language provided the soil from which later apocalyptic works were to grow."[17] But, in the final call one would have to classify Russell with those who favor foreign origins since he believes that ultimately even the post-exilic prophets received their doctrines from the Persian religion. He says that Jewish apocalyptic was influenced by the teachings of Babylon, Persia and Greece, but that these "influences are already to be found in post-exilic prophecy itself, from which apocalyptic sprang."[18] "It is against this background of Jewish-Hellenistic-Oriental syncretism that we are to understand the Jewish apocalyptic writers. Their thought and expression cannot be explained simply in terms of their Hebrew heritage."[19]

Walter Schmithals notes several areas in which apocalyptic seems to have been influenced by foreign ideas. These include the dualistic struggles between God and Satan, the final collapse of the world, celestial visions, and some of the more picturesque eschatological symbols of apocalyptic, such as fire coming down from the sky and stars falling from heaven.[20] Schmithals agrees with the others to an extent in saying that an influential force in the shaping of the apocalyptic is "the Iranian religion in particular, in the form given to it by Zarathustra."[21] He claimed that

---

[17]Ibid., p. 88.

[18]Ibid., p. 89.

[19]D. S. Russell, Apocalyptic: Ancient and Modern (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978), p. 8.

[20]Walter Schmithals, The Apocalyptic Movement: Introduction and Interpretation, trans. John E. Steely (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1975), pp. 113-15.

[21]Ibid., pp. 115-16.

> Precisely those apocalyptic features which cannot be derived from the Old Testament are found here: dualism; universalism and individualism; resurrection of the dead; predetermined periodically structured course of history; influence of evil in this good world; and eschatological victory of the good.[22]

Nevertheless, when the question is raised whether or not the origins of apocalyptic can be satisfactorily explained by Iranian religion, Schmithals is reluctant to say that Parsiism is sufficient.

> One must answer this question in the affirmative if it is inquiring into the origin of most of the motifs and conceptions which are alien to the Old Testament . . . To a large extent the specifically apocalyptic conceptions come from Iran, and even concerning the motifs of obviously Babylonian origin it has been assumed with good reason that they first enriched the Iranian view of history and reached Jewish apocalyptic by this route.[23]

But on the whole, when apocalyptic is looked at more comprehensively, Schmithals must conclude that the origins of apocalyptic literature cannot be explained by foreign religions.

> The successful search of the representatives of the history-of-religions school for the source of the apocalyptic conceptions which are foreign to the Old Testament does not actually succeed in accounting for the phenomenon of Jewish apocalyptic, and we must not conceal this fact by speaking unreflectively of Iranian "apocalyptic" only because in the religion of Zarathustra too the course of the world as a whole, including its end, is interpreted.[24]

Influence Primarily from the Old Testament

In 1975, Paul D. Hanson published his book The Dawn of Apocalyptic. Here Hanson defended the position that the apocalyptic writings were influenced primarily by the writings of the Old Testament and were only secondarily influenced by foreign elements. Hanson's thesis, of course, was nothing new, this position has been argued before, but it

---

[22] Ibid., p. 118.

[23] Ibid., pp. 118-19.

[24] Ibid., pp. 122-23.

was with this book that the position has received a fresh influx of support.

As early as 1905, Frank Chamberlin Porter at Yale University claimed that:

> The transition from prophecy to apocalypse was not sudden, and the Book of Daniel does not create a wholly new type of literature. Not only do the apocalyptical writers make much use of the prophetic books, but post-exilic prophecy, from Ezekiel on, develops in the apocalyptical direction. In order to understand the apocalypse, therefore, we must take account both of its dependence on prophecy and of the tendency of late prophecy to assume the apocalyptical type.[25]

Porter claims that the apocalyptical writings in part were an attempt to explain the unfulfilled prophecies of the canonical prophets.[26] No longer was there a message of judgment upon the nation of Israel, for that element had already been fulfilled. But now the apocalyptic message was a message of the restoration of Israel to power.

> The apocalypses represented a revival of prophecy. They are the latest type of Jewish prophetic writing. The revival of prophecy in Judaism meant the revival of national hopes and efforts. When these at last failed, Judaism dropped its apocalypses and settled back into legalism.[27]

Porter represents the "earlier generation" that H. H. Rowley referred to above. These writers were those who saw a close connection between the predictive element in both the apocalyptic and prophetic writings and thus postulated a linear development in the Jewish writings from the Old Testament to the apocalypses. R. H. Charles likewise belongs to this group. He claimed that "it can be shown that Old Testament prophecy and apocalyptic are not opposed to each other essentially: that fundamentally

---

[25] Frank Chamberlin Porter, The Messages of the Apocalyptical Writers, Vol. VIII, The Messages of the Bible, ed. Frank K. Sanders and Charles F. Kent (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905), p. 20.

[26] Ibid., pp. 20-21.

[27] Ibid., pp. 4-5.

they have a common basis and use for the most part the same methods."[28]

He claims that it can be shown that

> Prophecy and apocalyptic are, in the main, concerned with the same objects, that they use, in the main, the same methods, but that whereas the scope of prophecy was limited, as regards time and space, that of apocalyptic was as wide as the universe and as unlimited as time.[29]

This position, however, has been challenged by those who claim that this direct linage has been broken into by the influences of foreign eschatology and dualism.

However, even before The Dawn of Apocalyptic appeared H. H. Rowley attempted to moderate the views of those who saw apocalyptic primarily as the product of religious syncretism. Rowley does not entirely minimize the influence of foreign thought but claims that essentially "apocalyptic is the child of prophecy."[30] "There are, of course, certain obvious differences of form between the prophets and the apocalypticists"[31] but Rowley is reluctant to magnify these differences so much that prophecy and apocalyptic are largely bifurcated. Instead apocalyptic is "essentially the re-adaptation of the ideas and aspirations of earlier days to a new situation."[32]

Like the prophets of the earlier days, the apocalypticists emphasized a message of repentence and "getting right with God" before the yoke of the foreign oppressors could be thrown off.[33] In this sense

---

[28] R. H. Charles, Religious Development Between the Old and New Testaments (London: Williams and Norgate, 1927), p. 16.

[29] Ibid., p. 32.

[30] H. H. Rowley, Relevance of Apocalyptic, p. 15.

[31] Ibid.

[32] Ibid.

[33] Ibid., p. 22.

Daniel prefigured the tone of apocalypticism.

> It is fortitude under persecution that he encourages rather than revolt against oppression, and in this he is the forerunner of other apocalypticists. Here were situations quite different from those viewed by pre-exilic prophets, and . . . they mediated God's Word to the men of their day, instead of echoing the message given to earlier generations.[34]

Rowley cites several elements that became a part of the apocalyptic message. Among these elements are: a divine judgment upon the nations, deliverance of the righteous remnant, and a "Golden Age" period of peace.[35]

> That combination is characteristic of the eschatological hopes of the apocalyptic writers. There are indeed passages in the prophetic books where we find this combination, and especially in post-exilic prophecy do we find this gravitation towards the outlook of the apocalypticists.[36]

In Old Testament Apocalyptic: Its Origins and Growth Stanley Brice Frost maintains the same position. Frost, like Rowley, agrees that there is a strong Persian element in the apocalyptic writings.[37] It would have been very difficult for Judaism to escape from Persian influence. Nevertheless, the Persian elements did not manifest themselves in the strongest sense until the Greek period. Yet, even here, the primary framework of apocalyptic was Hebrew and not Persian.

> We need to recognize that the Persian contribution was to provide the form and expression of the native eschatological ideas. We have already remarked that the Hebrew eschatology was unique, but that statement is true only because it most probably precedes, and certainly profoundly differs from, the Iranian.[38]

---

[34] Ibid.

[35] Ibid., p. 24.

[36] Ibid.

[37] Stanley Brice Frost, Old Testament Apocalyptic: Its Origins and Growth (London: Epworth Press, 1952), p. 72.

[38] Ibid., p. 73.

As a result of this Persian influence, the Old Hebrew religion was "newly invigorated by contacts with Babylonian parallels" and "in general, prophecy shifted its eschatological interest from the outworking of history to the end of time itself, and re-emerged as apocalyptic."[39]

Later, Frank M. Cross and Walter Schmithals emphasized this point even more pungently. Cross claimed that

> The origins of apocalyptic must be searched for as early as the sixth century BCE. In the catastrophe of the exile the older forms of faith and tradition came into crisis, and Israel's institutions, including her religious institutions, collapsed or were transformed.[40]

While Schmithals in answer to the question of whether apocalyptic can be accounted for by way of a development in Jewish prophetic eschatology said: "It appears to me that we cannot deny such a decline."[41]

> In the prophets of this late period one has the impression that they anticipate a definitive saving action in which history will come to a halt. The coming judgment will sharply separate the pious and the godless, . . . Thus, this postexilic prophecy undoubtedly tends discernibly and more decidedly than did the pre-exilic, toward apocalyptic ideas.[42]

Yet, neither Cross nor Schmithals is willing to deny the obviously foreign ideas in the apocalyptic literature.

These previous works have all served as precursors to the most definitive study on the subject in recent years, Hanson's The Dawn of Apocalyptic. Hanson begins by claiming that the origins of apocalyptic have been misunderstood. Not only has the source of apocalyptic been misunderstood, but the period of its origin, the historical and social

---

[39]Ibid., pp. 82-83.

[40]Frank M. Cross, "New Directions in the Study of Apocalyptic," Apocalypticism, ed. Robert W. Funk, Journal for Theology and the Church, No. 6 (New York: Herder and Herder, 1969), p. 161.

[41]Schmithals, The Apocalyptic Movement, p. 132.

[42]Ibid., p. 134.

root, and the essential nature of apocalyptic have all been misunderstood.[43] This study by Hanson attempts to clarify these misunderstandings.

> It seeks to demonstrate that the rise of apocalyptic eschatology is neither sudden nor anomalous, but follows the pattern of an unbroken development from pre-exilic and exilic prophecy. Outside influences (e.g., Persian dualism and Hellenism) upon this apocalyptic eschatology appear to be late, coming only after its essential character was fully developed. They are thereby limited in their influence to peripheral embellishments.[44]

Concerning the theory that apocalyptic was derived from the wisdom literature (as von Rad contends), Hanson believes that the similarities with the wisdom literature stems from an effort by the apocalypticists to establish their credentials.[45] He claimed that in the second and third centuries B.C. the "prophets" encountered difficulties from their skeptics. As a result they attempted to mimic the wisdom literature and also resorted to the use of pseudonymous authorship. Nevertheless, Hanson does not believe that the essentials of Jewish apocalyptic were derived from "Wisdom."

For Hanson, the dawning of apocalyptic was a slow process. There was no one point in time when apocalyptic suddenly appeared. Instead it evolved over a period of time. Hanson would agree with Cross concerning the beginning of this change. This, Hanson said, began either in the late sixth century or the early fifth century B.C.[46] The beginnings of this can be detected in the work of Second Isaiah, which Hanson calls

---

[43] Hanson, The Dawn of Apocalyptic, p. 7.

[44] Ibid., pp. 7-8.

[45] Ibid., p. 9.

[46] Ibid., p. 27.

"proto-apocalyptic."[47] This was carried on by other early apocalyptic works such as Third Isaiah, Zechariah 9-10, and Isaiah 24-27. And subsequently this was continued by some of the later writers such as Ezekiel and Zechariah 11-14 who continued this motion toward the apocalyptic writings as they appeared in the second century B.C.[48] The contributing factors behind this change, Hanson believes, are the distressing events of Jewish history beginning with the loss of the Judean Kingdom and continuing into the second century B.C.[49] As a result, Jewish hopes were no longer centered upon a kingdom rising out of earthly affairs, but instead would be a kingdom brought about by the inbreaking of God.

But not even Hanson's treatment of the subject has escaped criticism. John N. Oswalt, while agreeing with the basic thrust of Hanson's argument, believes that the theory needs some fine tuning. It is Oswalt's contention that prophecy through the years did not "turn into" apocalyptic. Even though apocalyptic grew out of Old Testament prophecy, the prophetic writings continued to exist.[50] He notes that the New Testament continues the Old Testament view that God is acting in current history rather than picking up on the apocalyptic view that God has no part in the contemporary events. Thus Oswalt claimed that this harmony between "the Old and New Testament points of view suggests that the apocalyptic view did not replace the prophetic one, but rather

---

[47] Ibid.

[48] Ibid., pp. 27, 228-37.

[49] Ibid., p. 402.

[50] John N. Oswalt, "Recent Studies in Old Testament Eschatology and Apocalyptic" (Unpublished paper, Asbury Theological Seminary, 1981), p. 19.

existed beside it, enriching and expanding it but never supplanting it."[51] Oswalt said that Hanson glosses over the period between 425 and 175 too quickly, apparently neglecting the new elements of apocalyptic which eventually led to their rejection from the canon. "Thus, it appears that no straight line can be drawn between Zechariah and Enoch."[52] He does not claim that there is no connection between prophecy and apocalyptic, but he also does not claim that there has been a direct connection between them. In his words, "the middle way seems best."[53]

Nevertheless, despite Hanson's demonstration that prophetic and apocalyptic eschatology are similar, Oswalt objects to the extent to which this is carried and claims that the methods for establishing this connection involve considerable difficulties. Among these difficulties are:

> 1) An overemphasis upon the later prophet's use of mythical sources; 2) an unwarranted application of the cosmic war motif; 3) overconfidence in typologies of development, both literary and sociological; 4) rearrangement of the text with little or no consideration of possible alternate arrangements or explanations; 5) heavy dependence upon hypothetical reconstructions of Israelite society and history.[54]

Thus, Oswalt claimed that Hanson's work depends too much upon his unproven hypotheses.

> The result is that even those writers sympathetic to the school find its claims to have established a direct connection between prophecy and apocalyptic to be exaggerated. Even if it be granted that the visions of Zechariah have an apocalyptic flavor, they are still far from being an example of apocalyptic literature.[55]

---

[51] Ibid.

[52] Ibid.

[53] Ibid.

[54] Ibid., pp. 9-10.

[55] Ibid., p. 18.

This conclusion is supported by Richard J. Bauckham who agrees with Oswalt's position saying that "there remains a significant gulf, which is not only chronological, between this apocalyptic prophecy of the fifth century and the Hasidic apocalyptic of the second century."[56] To support this Bauckham notes several areas in which these groups differ, such as the lack of pseudonyms in prophetic apocalyptic, the lack of extensive historical surveys in prophetic apocalyptic, and undeveloped angelology and dualism in the prophets.[57] In Bauckham's opinion, "there still remains a problem of continuity between the apocalyptic prophecy and the later apocalyptic of Daniel and the intertestamental literature."[58]

Yet, however one may want to define the depth of agreement between these two bodies of literature or the degree toward which the one has supplanted the other, Hanson has written a well argued work demonstrating that the core of the apocalyptic teachings have been derived from Old Testament prophetic schemes rather than from an incorporation of foreign elements into Jewish thought.

Conclusion

Writers of time past, like writers of today, recognize that the intertestamental apocalyptic writings have both similarities and dissimilarities with the prophetic writings of the Old Testament. Likewise writers of yesterday and today both recognize that these apocalyptic writings have many similarities with the ancient writings of Babylon,

---

[56] Richard J. Bauckham, "The Rise of Apocalyptic," Themelios, n.s., III, No. 2 (1978), 12.

[57] Ibid.

[58] Ibid.

Persia, and Greece. Some writers, like Hanz Dieter Betz, minimize the similarities between prophecy and Apocalyptic and emphasize their dissimilarities. Thus this group of writers have turned to the ancient foreign religions to explain the origin of the new and different Hebrew writings--apocalyptic writings. Similarities in foreign eschatology and Apocalyptic are explained as Hebrew syncretism as the Jews began to borrow religious and eschatological ideas from their neighbors during the period following the exile.

Other writers, such as Paul D. Hanson, agree that Jewish Apocalyptic has been influenced by these foreign writings, however the influence from these foreign writings pertains only to the peripheral elements of Jewish Apocalyptic. In the opinion of these writers the essence of the Apocalyptic message has been derived from the Old Testament prophets, particularly the post-exilic prophets. Thus, with this position, similarities between prophecy and Apocalyptic are stressed while the dissimilarities are downplayed. Many of the similarities between the foreign writings and the apocalyptic writings can already be found in the prophetic writings.

Today, most scholars side with Hanson, and indeed the evidence seems to favor the position that the Jewish apocalyptic writings were derived mainly from the Old Testament prophetic writings. Nevertheless, it should still be recognized that the apocalyptic writings contain some elements that greatly differ with the prophetic writings and that the connection between the prophetic and apocalyptic writings is far from smooth.

Thus, in the investigation of the connection between the Jewish apocalyptic writings and the eschatology of the New Testament, one should

always keep an eye upon what the Old Testament might have to contribute to the study. Perhaps a theme emphasized in the apocalyptic writings and carried over into the New Testament, has its roots in the Old Testament. And of course there remains the possibility that the theme originated in an ancient foreign religion. At any rate, it is important to keep in mind parallels that might have a bearing on the matter from sources other than the New Testament and apocalyptic writings.

Chapter 5

JEWISH APOCALYPTIC INFLUENCES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Introduction

The intent of this chapter is to investigate motifs concerning the Messiah that are common in both the apocalyptic writings and the New Testament in order to determine what sort of an influence the apocalyptic writings might have had on the formation of New Testament Messianism. Here several themes have been selected for investigation because of their importance and commonality in connection with the Messiah. Thus, the first section of the chapter will deal with the difficult and often discussed topic of the Son of Man. The second section of the chapter will examine the signs and events that are said to accompany the coming of the Messiah. Under this area one subsection will investigate some of the apocalyptic imagery and signs surrounding the coming of the Messiah (such as earthquakes, famines, fire from heaven, and disturbances in the Sun, Moon, and Stars), while another subsection will deal with the eschatological opposition to the Messiah and his people. And finally the last section of this chapter will study the various names and titles given to the Messiah in the apocalyptic and New Testament writings. Names discussed under this category include the Son of God, Son of David, Melchizedek, and Messiah (or Christ).

The Son of Man

Attempts to discover the meaning of the Son of Man in Jesus'

teaching and to discover the origin of his thought on this matter are numerous, and several theories have been advanced claiming to offer a solution to the problem. This study does not pretend to offer any new solution to these questions, but instead it attempts to sort through significant and representative theories to discover those which have the most support. Bearing in mind the intention of this paper to discover the connection between Jewish apocalyptic and New Testament Messianism, particular attention will be devoted to an investigation of this connection.

The term "Son of Man" occurs 82 to 84 times in the gospels, once in Acts, once in Hebrews, and twice in Revelation. In every case it is referring to Jesus, and in the gospels it was never used by anyone except Jesus. However, the early church did not continue to use this expression and in the writings outside of the gospels it is used rarely. The corresponding Semitic expressions (both Hebrew and Aramaic) all carry the plain and simple meaning of "man." This was demonstrated by G. H. Dalman who added that it could be a Messianic designation when it is used in prophecy or poetry.[1] Likewise Martin McNamara commented "In the Palestinian Targum, particularly in Neofiti, bar nash, bar nasha--'a Son of Man,' 'the Son of Man'--is very often found in the sense of 'man,' 'anyone,' 'whoever.'"[2] Yet in the Targum of Ps. 80:17 the expression "the Son of Man" is rendered "King Messiah."

However, the New Testament use of the Son of Man is much broader

---

[1]G. H. Dalman, The Words of Jesus (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902), pp. 234-41.

[2]Martin McNamara, Targum and Testament: Aramaic Paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible: A Light on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ., 1972), p. 161.

than this Semitic idiomatic use. Scholars differ as to the exact meaning and the source (or sources) from which Jesus arrived at his concept, yet it is quite probable that Daniel 7:13 was a forerunner of the idea. The attachment of Daniel with the Son of Man in the apocalyptic section of Matthew 24 would point in this direction. Also C. F. D. Moule has reasoned that since the Son of Man in the gospels invariably uses the article, this indicates a reference to a particular Son of Man--probably the one of Daniel.[3] While not disputing a lineage running from Daniel many scholars look deeper for the origin of this idea.

Fredrick Houk Borsch goes well beyond Judaism in order to discover the roots of the Son of Man concept. Borsch uses the tools of comparative religions and finds that parallels to the Son of Man can be found in many of the Near Eastern religions and cults just prior to the rise of Christianity.[4] His thesis is that the Near Eastern King-Man mythology eventually grew into the Son of Man ideology found in the gospels. Parallels to the Son of Man concept are found in such figures as the Anthropos, the Great Man, the Perfect Man, Adam, and the Heavenly Man. And in each of these figures he discovers the common motif of a royal person who is exposed to suffering and humiliation, after which he is again restored to his exaulted office.[5] In early Judaism this figure was expressed in the person of Adam and also in the King (as expressed in the royal Psalms 16,18,21,22,69,89,116, and 118). Thus to Borsch the concepts of the King, Suffering Servant, Messiah, First

---

[3]C. F. D. Moule, The Origin of Christology (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), pp. 12-14.

[4]Fredrick Houk Borsch, The Son of Man in Myth and History (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967), pp. 55-88.

[5]Ibid., pp. 121-22.

Man, and the Son of Man are all related in origin.

Furthermore, Borsch claimed that many of the baptizing sects of the first century A.D. such as Mandaism included beliefs in a "Man" connected with their baptismal practices.[6] Thus, he concluded that the association of baptism with "the Man" reaches "back to the ancient kingship ideologies."[7] However, the expression "Son of Man" does not occur in the literature of these baptizing sects. This has led A. J. B. Higgins to say:

> Even if the "special man" was regarded as the son of man, in the sense that the king, as a royal personage, was the descendent and representative of Adam, to attempt to forge a link between this concept and the son of man of Jewish eschatology, and then to unite them with Jesus' own use of the term, is building castles in the air.[8]

Nevertheless, Borsch's position is that the Son of Man was just one of the many expressions of the Near Eastern king-man mythology which found its way into Jewish apocalyptic and from there influenced Jesus.[9]

Borsch, however, has apparently fallen into one of the pitfalls of the History of Religions School. Attention must be given to the fact that similar material in two bodies of literature does not necessarily indicate a common source for that material. This is especially true when the similarities between the material is of a very general nature, such as in the present case. A very common literary plot is the "rags to riches" story, along with its inverse, riches to rags, or even a combination of the two such as the theme found in these king-man myths: riches

---

[6] Ibid., pp. 218-19.

[7] Ibid., p. 219.

[8] A. J. B. Higgins, The Son of Man in the Teaching of Jesus (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), p. 6.

[9] Borsch, p. 230.

to rags to riches. Thus, it does not seem very surprising when parallels of this general sort are found in ancient literature. Indeed such parallels can be found in modern literature. But when one tries to determine a causal connection between the two the theory appears weak.

Carsten Colpe's article in The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament uses a methodology similar to that used by Borsch. Colpe, however, comes to a different conclusion concerning the origin of the Son of Man concept. Colpe, like Borsch, uses a History of Religions approach, but Colpe demands a slightly more stringent parallel before assuming a genealogical relationship between religious ideas.

To begin, Colpe asserts "the impossibility of an Israelite genealogy of the idea of the Son of Man" saying that several traits "point directly to an origin of the concept outside the tradition of Israel."[10] These traits include the representation of the four kingdoms by beasts, the "in the clouds of heaven" motif, and the idea of a heavenly man ruling over a renewed kingdom. The primitive use of "Son of Man" in Ezekiel and Psalm 80 took on a collective sense which was later picked up by the apocalypticists, but these concepts as expressed by Ezekiel and Psalm 80 do not contain the more fully developed ideas that were expressed by the apocalypticists and the New Testament. Thus, Colpe looks to other sources for the origin.

In looking at the literature outside of Judaism, Colpe finds it unlikely that the Son of Man originated in Iranian, Babylonian, Egyptian, and Gnostic circles. In each case the connection falls short of indicating any substantial borrowing.[11] However, in the case of

---

[10]Carsten Colpe, "ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου," The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament (1972), VIII, 406.

[11]Ibid., pp. 408-15.

Canaanite mythology, Colpe finds what he believes to be the source of the Son of Man ideas.[12] The Ras Shamra texts, Colpe believes, reveal the origin of Daniel's fourth beast (the chaos dragon, Ltn), the Son of Man (the storm god, Baal), and the Ancient of Days (the King and Creator, El). According to the myth, Baal (who comes on the clouds) defeats Ltn and thereafter is set up as the ruler of the world by El the "gray-haired father of years."[13] Colpe himself notes several instances in which the parallel breaks down, yet he still defends his position saying: "In spite of such objections the Canaanite hypothesis does so far come closest to the actual facts."[14]

The later apocalyptic writings, in turn, borrowed from Daniel. Such is the case with the Son of Man in the Similitudes of Enoch and the Son of Man in II Esdras. However, according to Colpe none of these apocalyptic writings display a sufficient concept of the Son of Man to account for the New Testament use of this expression.[15] In Daniel the Son of Man figure is representative--representing either the heavenly host or the people of God (Israel). Thus, the Son of Man is a collective figure taking on an eschatological saving function, but is not specifically a Messiah or redeemer. In I Enoch the Son of Man takes on the role of an individual eschatological figure. However the Son of Man is not specifically a Messianic title, even though this figure here begins to take on Messianic roles, such as the eschatological judge. In Enoch 70-71, Enoch himself is elevated to this exalted position. Here he takes on the

---

[12] Ibid., pp. 415-19.

[13] Ibid., p. 416.

[14] Ibid., p. 419.

[15] Ibid., pp. 420-30.

"office and function of the eschatological Son of Man, with perhaps a suggestion that the earthly man Enoch is transformed into the heavenly being, the Son of Man."[16] And in II Esdras the Son of Man idea is carried even farther, combining national and political hopes with the "breaking in" of the Son of Man. However, the late date of this document indicates that it probably had no influence upon the New Testament.

Thus, to account for the New Testament use of the Son of Man, Colpe considers Jesus to be another Jewish source upon which the later church built the fully developed Son of Man concept.[17] From the New Testament tradition Colpe extracts what he believes is Jesus' own preaching of the Son of Man. This includes the idea of a future Son of Man who acts in the role of a savior and judge. He will appear suddenly and will appear in the heavenly court of judgment where he will judge men. This Son of Man will not come to earth and Jesus did not claim to be this future figure of the eschaton. However, the later church, when its hopes for a political Messiah collapsed, expected the imminent parousia of the risen Jesus to earth, and added other features to the sayings, such as the suffering servant concept.[18]

Yet, Jesus did not specifically equate himself with the Son of Man. Instead he equated his role and his preaching with the future Son of Man. "Jesus' own role in the eschaton begins with the mere fact that He preaches the Kingdom of God."[19] However Colpe claims that this understanding of the Son of Man was later changed.

---

[16]Ibid., p. 427.

[17]Ibid., p. 429.

[18]Ibid., p. 444.

[19]Ibid., p. 440.

> The apocalyptic Son of Man is a symbol of Jesus' assurance of perfecting. With a shift from the assurance to the one who has it, the whole process may be interpreted as a dynamic and functional equating of Jesus and the coming Son of Man with the future perfecting of Jesus in view. On this view the primitive community then made of it a static personal identification accomplished already in the present Jesus.[20]

Colpe's theory provides some interesting parallels to the imagery found in Daniel, but it is not necessary to turn to Canaanite literature to find a source that Daniel could have used. The imagery of riding on the clouds can be found in some of the earliest Jewish literature (Ex. 13:21, 19:9, 16-18, and 34:10). Thus, the beginnings of this material could have originated as early as Moses. On the other hand, if it was the product of the Jahvist, it at least was in existence before 850 B.C. In either case there is no reason why the book of Daniel could not have gotten it from this source. This is especially true when one considers the exalted position that the Torah has acquired during the post-exilic period.

This is also the case with the connection made between the chaos dragon, Ltn, and Daniel's fourth beast. J. A. Emerton has mentioned that "The Ugaritic texts tell of the slaying of the dragon Ltn, who is probably to be associated with the O.T. Leviathan. These Ugaritic passages have close affinities in language with the O.T."[21] In particular, Emerton cites Job 26:13 and Is. 27:1. Thus, even if Daniel's fourth beast closely parallels the Canaanite Ltn, Ltn closely parallels the O.T. Leviathan, therefore there is no need to suggest a Canaanite source for Daniel's idea since he could have received it from O.T. sources.

---

[20] Ibid., p. 441.

[21] J. A. Emerton, "The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery," Journal of Theological Studies, IX (1958), 228.

Likewise the setting of Daniel is paralleled by scenes from Ez. 1, Deut. 33:2, and Ps. 68:17, where items such as the thousands of attendants, the throne, the wheels, the fire, and the four figures find their analogues. Emerton, following the lead of Aage Bentzen, claimed that this setting corresponds well with the enthronement scenes of the Royal Psalms. Just as the Son of Man in Daniel is given dominion over the Kingdom so also is the Davidic king crowned.

> Bentzen argues that, although in the present form of Dan. 7 the Son of Man symbolizes the Jewish people, in the tradition behind the chapter he is the king. This argument is based on the view that Pss. 2 and 110, among others, reflect a cultic situation at the festival. Yahwe's vicegerent, the Davidic king, is enthroned on Mount Zion in the face of the opposition of the nations, who are compelled to submit.[22]

Yet, the citing of Emerton and Bentzen here is not meant to imply that they believe the sources of Daniel's Son of Man can only be found in the O.T. Both claim that Canaanite myths lie beneath these O.T. parallels.

> This interpretation of the Son of Man imagery is able to explain his eschatological role as an organic whole. It is able to set it in a well-established Israelite context and to do justice to the O.T. affinities, and yet, at the same time, to offer an adequate account of the parallels in the mythology of the ancient Near East.[23]

It is the contention of this writer, however, that one is not able to determine who borrowed from who in this case (if in fact any borrowing even did occur) and that it is not necessary to postulate that Daniel, or for that matter Jesus, borrowed from Canaanite myth in their use of this imagery.

If foreign sources are thereby laid aside as having any significant contribution to the New Testament Son of Man, one is left with Old Testament and Jewish apocalyptic material to account for the idea. In

---

[22] Ibid., p. 231.

[23] Ibid., p. 242.

the O.T., as was stated above, the most likely source of information was the seventh chapter of Daniel. But the phrase also occurs in Ezekiel ninety-three times and elsewhere through the O.T. in scattered references. In Jewish apocalyptic literature at least sixteen references are made to the Son of Man in the Similitudes of Enoch and II Esdras apparently refers to this figure in the sixth vision.

To investigate possible sources for the N.T. expression, it would be beneficial to divide the N.T. sayings into groups and look for parallels that correspond to these groups. The Son of Man sayings in the synoptic gospels separate into three main groups: sayings where the Son of Man's present life and ministry are expressed; sayings where the Son of Man's future sufferings and death are stressed; and sayings where the Son of Man's future apocalyptic coming is predicted. The Son of Man sayings in the Gospel of John do not easily fit into these three categories although many of the passages could fit into the "present life and ministry" or "sufferings and death" category.

Many scholars reject some or all of these groups of sayings as belonging to the authentic logia of Jesus, but these attempts are unconvincing. The fact that outside of Acts 7:56, and Rev. 1:13 and 14:14 the expression is never used by anyone except Jesus should indicate the unlikelihood that the early church placed the words in the mouth of Jesus. Otherwise one would expect to see the expression elsewhere in the early writings of the church, which is simply not the case.

The first group of sayings, those which speak of the present life and ministry of the Son of Man, contain several interesting features. First, some passages in this group seem to preserve a fraction of the Old Semitic idiomatic usage of "a man." Yet, concurrently these verses also

indicate one who is more than just a human.[24] Mark 2:10 says: "But that you may know that the Son of Man has authority on earth to forgive sins . . ." Here the Son of Man may be understood as a self-designation by Jesus, meaning "this man" while the following phrase ("has authority on earth to forgive sins") would be an indication that "this man" is more than just an ordinary man; he has the authority of God himself. In Matthew 12:1-8 Jesus' disciples are criticized for plucking and eating grain on the sabbath. Jesus answers by asking the Pharisees "Have you not read in the law how on the sabbath the priests in the temple profane the sabbath, and are guiltless? I tell you something greater than the temple is here. . . . For the Son of Man is lord of the sabbath" (12:5-8). Here again the Son of Man functions not only as a self designation but it is also used by Jesus as a title indicating someone who is more than just an ordinary man. And similar to this, in John 1:51 Jesus says "you will see heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man." These words bring to mind the story of Jacob's ladder in Genesis 28. In Genesis 28 the angels are ascending and descending upon a ladder while in Jesus' words the angels are ascending and descending upon the Son of Man. Without any doubt Jacob had found the place where heaven touched earth (Gen. 28:12) and where God reached down to men. Jesus likewise was claiming that the Son of Man (this man)

---

[24]Sherman E. Johnson, "Son of Man," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, ed. George Arthur Buttrick (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), I, 414.

was the connecting link between God and men.[25]

The "present life and ministry" sayings perhaps contain yet another strand of meaning. This extends back to the book of Ezekiel and involves Ezekiel's self understanding that went along with his call to ministry as the Son of Man. This was suggested by Alan Richardson,[26] who understood this to be the only meaning of the Son of Man. However, Richardson seems to err here since as Ladd claimed "This quite fails to explain the eschatological use of Son of Man in the Gospels."[27] Nevertheless, this self understanding does seem to be implied as part of Jesus' use of the Son of Man.

> Ezekiel had regarded himself as a sign vouchsafed to his generation (as indeed other prophets had regarded themselves--Ez. 12:6; 24:24). The Son of Man, Ezekiel, had been sent to speak God's word to the house of Israel, whether they would hear or whether they would forbear: "He that heareth let him hear" (3:27). The Son of Man, Jesus, is also sent to proclaim God's word to the house of Israel (Matt. 10:6), and he cries, "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear" (Mark 4:9).[28]

The very mention of the expression "Son of Man" in N.T. times would bring Ezekiel to the minds of Jesus' listeners, since the book that bears his name uses the expression over ninety times to refer to Ezekiel. When Jesus applied this term to himself, his hearers would naturally assume that

---

[25]George Eldon Ladd, A Theology of the New Testament (Grand Rapids; Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ., 1974), pp. 245-46, observed that "Some scholars interpret this saying in terms of the eschatological coming of the Son of Man, . . . However, this saying clearly embodies an allusion to Jacob's vision of a ladder reaching to heaven, and a more natural interpretation in the context of Johannine thought is that Jesus as the Son of Man has come to establish communication between heaven and earth." This interpretation is supported by the fact that John nowhere else uses the Son of Man expression in a future eschatological sense.

[26]Alan Richardson, An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament (New York: Harper and Brothers Publ., 1958), pp. 128-36.

[27]Ladd, Theology of the New Testament, p. 147.

[28]Richardson, p. 21.

Jesus was claiming a prophetic office. Thus, when Jesus asked his disciples "who do men say that the Son of Man is?" (Matt. 16:13), they answered "Some say John the Baptist, others say Elijah, and others Jeremiah or one of the prophets" (v. 14).[29] Likewise in the parable of the sower Jesus identifies the Son of Man as "He who sows the good seed" (Matt. 13:37).

This understanding of the Son of Man also seems to be reflected in I Enoch. In the confusing seventieth and seventy-first chapters, after the completion of the third parable, it is said that Enoch himself becomes the Son of Man. This is first suggested in I Enoch 70:1 where Enoch's "name during his lifetime was raised aloft to that Son of Man and to the Lord of Spirits." Later in I Enoch 71:14 this is explicitly stated when an angel said to Enoch "You are the Son of Man who is born unto righteousness." R. H. Charles in order to account for this problem passage changed this statement to "This is the Son of Man . . ." and changed the following statements from "you" to "him."[30] This, however, is a weak attempt to dissolve the difficulty and actually clouds the meaning of the text.

Here in chapters 70 and 71 Enoch seems to preserve a meaning of the Son of Man that is an intermediary understanding of the expression lying between Ezekiel's use and the later titular use of the Gospels. Apparently Enoch enters into this office as a prophet. Thus, Enoch like Ezekiel is called the Son of Man. This is supported by the fact that

---

[29]For some reason the disciples did not include Ezekiel's name among the prophets when they answered. However, this does not negate the possibility that Jesus was appealing to a motif from Ezekiel, since Ezekiel is never mentioned by name in the New Testament. Mention is usually made only of the more prominent prophets.

[30]Charles, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, II, 237.

Enoch is also called Son of Man in I En. 60:10 where an angel said to Enoch: "Thou Son of Man, herein thou dost seek to know what is hidden." This saying is set in the context of the third parable of Enoch and lies in the section designated by Charles as the Book of Noah. Here Enoch (Noah's forefather) wished to know the secrets of God in order that he might prophesy to his children. Some time later, as Noah related "my great-grandfather Enoch gave me the explanation of all the secrets in a book and the parables which had been given to him; and he put them together for me in the words of the Book of the Parables" (I En. 68:1). Thus even in the I En. 60:10 passage it appears that Enoch is given the name Son of Man not simply as a designation for "man" but rather because Enoch is functioning in the role of a prophet. Then in I En. 71:14 the prophetic use of Son of Man (from Ezekiel) seems to be combined with Enoch's more common use of the Son of Man--as a Messianic title. Both of these elements are found together in the section from I En. 71:14-17. Enoch himself is still called the Son of Man, but yet unmistakable Messianic qualities are attributed to him. These Messianic statements claim that the Son of Man (Enoch) is righteous, that his days will last forever, and that the Saints will have their dwelling place with him (71:14-17).

Thus, the present life and ministry passages of the Son of Man seem to preserve more than just a "self designation" usage by Jesus. In these passages the Son of Man is more than just an ordinary man; here the Son of Man is singled out as a special man. In Jesus' own veiled way, this special man implicitly suggests a reference to the Messiah. Beyond this, it also seems likely that the present life and ministry sayings indicate that the Son of Man in Jesus' time was understood to be a prophet.

This understanding of the Son of Man can initially be found in Ezekiel, but there are other Son of Man sayings that suggest this understanding in I Enoch and in the gospels.

The second group of Son of Man sayings in the Gospels is the group where the Son of Man's future sufferings and death are stressed. C. F. D. Moule claims that this connection between suffering and the Son of Man was founded in the writings of Daniel.[31] In particular, he associates the figure "like a Son of Man" with the "saints" who are made to suffer (Dan. 7:21-22, 25-27). Thus, the "one like a Son of Man" is interpreted to be a corporate representative of the Jewish people. Since the people are said to suffer, Moule likewise interprets the Son of Man figure as being one who suffers.

> As the chapter stands now . . . the saints are symbolized by the Human One--not identified with, but represented by him: and if the saints are partially and temporarily eclipsed, only to be subsequently glorified, then exactly the same may be presumed to be appropriately predicated of the Human Figure. If so, then "the Son of Man" already means "the representative of God's chosen people, destined through suffering to be exalted."[32]

Others, carry this idea farther. Morna Hooker claimed that the Son of Man in Daniel is not a single individual, but is a symbol for the Jewish people as a whole.[33] Thus, Daniel is not conveying any information about the Messiah (or a suffering Messiah) but instead is relating the sufferings of the Jewish people, which is to be followed by their

---

[31] C. F. D. Moule, The Phenomenon of the New Testament, Studies in Biblical Theology, second series, no. 1 (Naperville, IL: Alec. R. Allenson, 1967), pp. 88-89.

[32] Ibid., p. 89.

[33] Morna D. Hooker, The Son of Man in Mark (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1967), pp. 11-12.

exaltation--when they receive the kingdom.[34] As the previous oppressive kingdoms were symbolized by beasts, so the kingdom of the Jewish people is symbolized by "one like a Son of Man."[35] In this section "Daniel sums up the heart of his contrast between the kingdoms of this earth and the kingdom which is from above."[36]

Jesus' conception of the Son of Man follows this line. Jesus saw himself as fulfilling the role of the Son of Man (the saints of Israel). Thus:

> the Son of Man can--and will--suffer when his rightful position and God's authority are denied: this is the situation in Dan. 7, where the "beasts" have revolted against God and have crushed Israel who, as Son of Man, should be ruling the earth with the authority granted by God.[37]

Jesus saw himself as typifying the Son of Man. Here, "it is possible that the term may have been used in a corporate sense, though the present form of the saying has clearly been interpreted by the evangelists as referring to Jesus."[38]

At first glance, this connection between the "suffering" sayings in the Gospels and the Son of Man section in Daniel seems appealing. But further investigation of this connection reveals problems. First, there are good reasons for disputing Hooker's claim that the Son of Man in Daniel is a symbol of Jewish saints and that this expression carries no Messianic connotations. This assumption is based upon the verses in Daniel 7:13-14,18,22, and 27. In verses 13-14 it is said that the king-

---

[34]Ibid., p. 11, p. 78.

[35]Ibid., pp. 26-27.

[36]Ibid., p. 27.

[37]Ibid., p. 108.

[38]Ibid., p. 143.

dom and dominion shall be given to the Son of Man. But, in verses 18, 22, and 27 the kingdom is given to "the saints of the Most High." Thus, the Son of Man is interpreted to be a symbol of the saints. C. F. Keil, however, does not agree with this interpretation:

> The delivering of the kingdom to the people of God does not, according to the prophetic mode of contemplation, exclude the Messiah as its King, but much rather includes Him, inasmuch as Daniel, like the other prophets knows nothing of a Kingdom without a head, a Messianic Kingdom without the King Messiah.[39]

Furthermore, the Son of Man in Daniel is attributed with divine qualities, something that would not likely be ascribed to a corporate body of pious Jews. Emerton has argued that "the act of coming with clouds suggests a theophany of Yahweh himself. If Dan. 7:13 does not refer to a divine being, then it is the only exception out of about seventy passages in the O.T."[40] This is the same conclusion that Kiel arrived at when he said that "The clouds are the veil or the 'chariot' on which God comes from heaven to execute judgment against his enemies; cf. Ps. 18:10f., 97:2-4, 104:3, Is. 19:1, Nah. 1:3."[41] This makes it seem highly unlikely that the Son of Man expression in Daniel refers to a corporate concept.

Also it can be added that the earliest traditions of the rabbis (which may preserve traditions extending back as far as the second century B.C.) understood the Dan. 7:13 passage Messianically. Rabbi Akiba (from the end of the first century A.D.) in explaining the placing of the thrones in Dan. 7:9 said: "One throne was for Himself [Yahweh]

---

[39] C. F. Keil, Biblical Commentary on the Book of Daniel, trans. M. G. Easton, Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament by C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ., n.d.), p. 235.

[40] Emerton, pp. 231-32.

[41] Keil, pp. 235-36.

and one for David [the Davidic Messiah]. Even as it has been taught: One was for Himself and one for David: this is Rabbi Akiba's view."[42] Likewise Joshua Ben Levi (around A.D. 250) said "if Israel behaved worthily, the Messiah would come in the clouds of Heaven; if otherwise, humble and riding upon an ass."[43] This apparently is a reference to Dan. 7:13 and Zech. 9:9. Thus, it appears that Dan. 7:13 implies a reference to the Messiah even though it is not made explicit.

Yet, this still does not negate the possibility that the Son of Man can represent the saints while still maintaining his own individual identity--as Moule has suggested. If this position is maintained it should be determined how the Son of Man acts as a representative of the saints. Moule claimed that this figure represents the saints in their suffering for righteousness' sake and in their later glorification.[44] However, this interpretation receives little support from the text. Certainly one could infer a political or religious representation of the saints from this passage, but to conclude that the Son of Man typifies their suffering and exaltation is going beyond the available evidence. Ladd interprets this passage to mean that "the saints suffer on earth while the Son of Man receives the Kingdom in heaven, and then presumably brings it to the afflicted saints on earth."[45]

As far as the apocalyptic writings are concerned, there is very little evidence to indicate that the Son of Man (or even the Messiah) would suffer and die. II Esdras makes reference to a figure which could

---

[42] The Babylonian Talmud, Seder Nezikin, "Sanhedrin" 38b.

[43] The Babylonian Talmud, Seder Nezikin, "Sanhedrin" 98a.

[44] Moule, Phenomenon of the New Testament, p. 89.

[45] Ladd, Theology of the New Testament, p. 148.

possibly be an allusion to the Son of Man when II Esdras 13:32 says "then my Son will be revealed, whom you saw as a man coming up from the sea"--a reference to 13:3. But certainly no title is used here. The Greek and Semitic originals of this work do not survive, but the word "Son" here may go back to the Greek word παῖς, which can also be translated "servant." Thus, this could be an obscure reference to Isaiah's suffering servant. However, this is an unlikely connection. And it is even more unlikely that Jesus was influenced by this.

Similarly, some scholars have attempted to uncover references to the suffering servant in I Enoch which would tie this concept with the Son of Man. In this respect, William Manson has cited several instances in which he believes Enoch has borrowed from Isaiah's terminology.[46] These instances include such passages as I En. 46:9, 48:4,10, 49:3, 52:4, 62:2-3, and 71:14. Here Manson notes that both Enoch's Son of Man and Isaiah's suffering servant are called by God, are called the Lord's anointed, are given special wisdom and righteousness, are lights to the Gentiles, and both receive the worship of Kings.[47]

However such a gaunt comparison of the two figures can hardly establish a relationship between the Son of Man and the suffering servant. Enoch's Son of Man never suffers or dies, and in fact it is said that "there shall be length of days with that Son of Man" (I En. 71:17). This has led Russell to say:

> Indeed, what strikes us is not the similarity but the stark difference between the two figures. The servant suffers pain, humiliation and death, and by the vicarious offering of himself brings to men expiation of their sins; the only involvement of the Son of Man in the

---

[46]William Manson, Jesus the Messiah (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1946), pp. 235-37.

[47]Ibid.

> affairs of mortal men is to judge the world, to destroy God's enemies and to deliver his people from their hands. The deliverance wrought by the Son of Man is not salvation from the power of sin, but deliverance from the oppression of their enemies. He is the terrible judge of sinners, not the Saviour of men's souls.[48]

Thus, it seems that Jesus did not get his teaching of a suffering Son of Man from I Enoch. This may very well be Jesus' own contribution to Messianic understandings.

The third group of Son of Man sayings in the Gospels (those which stress his future apocalyptic coming) have many similarities with the apocalyptic passages found in both the Old Testament and the apocalyptic writings. This has led many scholars to the conclusion that Jesus was an apocalypticist and derived the main thrust of his teaching from Jewish apocalypticism. Others, however, are not willing to go that far.

Since this section is dealing with the Son of Man, and since the only Jewish apocalyptic books that deal with "Son of Man" terminology are I Enoch and II Esdras, this investigation of the apocalyptic Son of Man sayings in the Gospels will be compared only with the apocalypticism of I Enoch and II Esdras. It is recognized that this approach will not give a comprehensive picture of Messianic apocalypticism (this will be examined in the following section), but this will allow for an examination of the Son of Man from an apocalyptic perspective and will allow for a comparison of the apocalyptic Son of Man in I Enoch and II Esdras with the apocalyptic Son of Man of Jesus.

Several parallels between I Enoch and Daniel can be observed throughout Enoch's pages and it is likely that I Enoch probably borrowed

---

[48]Russell, Method and Message, p. 340.

from Daniel.[49] This borrowing likely involved not only the expression "Son of Man" but also involved several apocalyptic images. Furthermore, it is probable that Daniel's use of the Son of Man was as a Messianic figure even though it was not used as a Messianic title. However, I Enoch, drawing upon Daniel's and Ezekiel's use of the Son of Man, made the expression a title. This conclusion, however, is disputed by Maurice Casey.

Casey claims that even though the author of I Enoch makes use of Daniel 7, he does not use the expression as a title. "He used the term 'Son of Man' as an expression for 'man,' choosing it rather than any other term for 'man' because he was inspired by the vision of Dan. 7:9f. with its use of 'Son of Man' at Dan. 7:13."[50] Casey believes that by this expression the writer of I Enoch was referring to his hero, Enoch.[51] This is supported by I Enoch 70-71, where Enoch became the Son of Man. Thus, to Casey, the Son of Man is Enoch himself, who has been exalted and becomes an intermediary figure between God and man, acting as the eschatological judge and redeemer.[52] Similarly, Casey believes that Jesus used the expression "Son of Man" in an idiomatic way. When Jesus used "the Son of Man" he was talking about "man" in general. But he was also implicitly saying something about himself as well. "I suggest that it was a general statement, but Jesus deliberately used it to say something about himself in accordance with normal Aramaic idiom."[53] Further-

---

[49] See below, pp. 118-19.

[50] Maurice Casey, Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7 (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1979), p. 112.

[51] Ibid., p. 111.

[52] Ibid., p. 106.

[53] Ibid., p. 228.

more, according to Casey Jesus did not use the Son of Man messianically. In fact, Jesus did not even derive his use of the Son of Man from Daniel.[54] Instead, the apocalyptic sayings of the Son of Man in the gospels are later additions by the early church, who used Daniel 7 as the basis for their writings about the parousia.[55] "This group of sayings which utilize Dan. 7:13 to speak of the Son of Man coming have their Sitz im Leben in the early church. . . . It follows that Jesus himself did not speak of his second coming."[56] Thus, for Casey both I Enoch and the early Christian church used Dan. 7:13 to promote their own apocalyptic figure. "Both believed in a supreme human figure who was now in heaven and was of such majesty that he must play an important role in the last times that were already upon them" and "both identified the man-like figure as their own."[57] Apparently Casey sees the Son of Man in the Gospels and the Son of Man in the Similitudes as two completely unrelated traditions, other than the fact that they both were derived from Daniel.

Yet Casey's conclusions rest upon questionable evidence. First, as it was mentioned above, there are good reasons for believing that the Son of Man in Daniel was a Messianic figure. When the Son of Man is first mentioned in the Similitudes (I En. 46:2) it is in the context of an obvious reference to Daniel 7. Here Enoch's "Head of Days" (I Enoch 46:1) is described just as Daniel's "Ancient of Days" (Dan. 7:9). Furthermore the Son of Man in Enoch "had the appearance of a man" while in Daniel he was "one like a Son of Man." Obviously the Son of Man is the

---

[54] Ibid., p. 213.

[55] Ibid.

[56] Ibid., p. 217.

[57] Ibid., p. 214.

same person in both books. Also twelve out of Enoch's sixteen references to the Son of Man use the demonstrative pronoun, "that Son of Man." R. H. Charles argued that the Ethiopic demonstratives "are usually renderings of the Greek article. . . . Thus in Enoch this title is the distinct designation of the personal Messiah, and the Greek equivalent must have been ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου."[58]

Likewise, the New Testament almost invariably uses the article with the Son of Man (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου). It has been noted already that Moule claimed that this indicated a particular Son of Man--probably Daniel's. But this titular use as found in the Gospels could follow the earlier precedent as it is found in Enoch.

On the other hand, however, is R. H. Charles, who claimed that I Enoch is the source of the New Testament use of the Son of Man "and contributes to it some of its most characteristic contents."[59] Charles claimed that "Nearly all the writers of the New Testament were familiar with it, and were more or less influenced by it in thought and diction."[60] In particular Charles notes that apocalyptic themes such as the judgment, the resurrection, the Messiah and the Kingdom in I Enoch influenced the N.T. He lists a few examples (59) which "clearly illustrate this."[61]

Yet, it appears that Charles has largely overstated the case. If the parallels that he cited are representative of the N.T. it is signifi-

---

[58]Charles, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, II, 214. Casey disputes Charles' conclusion by noting that Enoch's "the Elect One" is never changed to a demonstrative, Son of Man, p. 100. But this criticism fails because Daniel never mentions "the Elect One." Thus, Enoch's translator had no reference in Daniel to call "that Elect One."

[59]Ibid., II, 185.

[60]Ibid., II, 163.

[61]Ibid., II, 180-81.

cant to note that the influence in the gospels (and thus the teachings of Jesus) was much smaller than in the rest of the New Testament. The Gospels make up about 45% of the N.T. material. But of Charles' parallels only 12 out of 59 parallels come from the Gospels (20%). Also of these 12 parallels, several examples are forced, and probably show no connection between one another. For example, Charles assumed that I En. 40:9 influenced Matt. 19:29 simply because both use the words "inherit eternal life." In fact, evidence of direct borrowing from Enoch is scarce in the Gospels.

Despite the lack of a large number of close parallels, it should not be quickly assumed that I Enoch had very little or no influence on the apocalyptic Son of Man in the Gospels. There are several apocalyptic motifs that occur in both sources and it is quite likely that Enoch's apocalypticism had filtered down into common Jewish usage. The despairing circumstances of the Jewish people during the intertestamental period would suggest a good reason why apocalyptic perspectives became popular during this time. Thus, there seems to be good reason for believing that Jesus picked up much of this terminology indirectly from Enoch. Yet, caution should be used in this area, since it is hard to determine what came from the apocalyptic passages of the O.T. and what came from the intertestamental apocalyptic writings. In one case (the use of the Son of Man as a title) there is a good reason for believing that Enoch influenced Jesus (whether directly or indirectly), since Enoch is the first book to use the expression as a title.

The case for influence in the Gospels from the apocalyptic Son of Man in II Esdras is much weaker. In the first place, the Son "as a man coming up from the sea" is far from being a Messianic title in

II Esdras. And secondly, the late date for II Esdras indicates that it had no direct influence on the N.T. Son of Man. However, it may be that II Esdras reflects an earlier tradition in Jewish circles and in this light several of the parallels in the sixth vision (II Esdras 13) may have influenced Christian ideas. However assigning II Esdras' vision to an earlier period cannot be established with any degree of certainty.

Concerning the use of the expression Son of Man as a title, it can be observed that the categories of sayings in the gospels all speak of the Son of Man in a distinctive sense--as a special man. Thus it becomes rather apparent that in the gospels, the Son of Man has become a title. It is likely that the title developed as a result of a growth in meaning--from "a man" to a specific and special man. As has been mentioned already, Moule has pointed out the significance of the article in this expression pointing out a specific Son of Man, probably the one in Daniel. However, the use of this expression in Daniel is not titular. In Dan. 7:13 the figure coming on the clouds is said to be "like a son of man." Thus, according to the idiomatic use, this could be rendered "one like a man." Furthermore, in Dan. 8:17 the term Son of Man is applied to Daniel himself in this same sense. Thus, the use of "Son of Man" as a title must have originated with Jesus, or it was derived from titular use elsewhere.

The beginnings of "Son of Man" being used as a title can be seen in the book of Ezekiel, although certainly there are no Messianic or N.T. meanings attached to the expression here. In Ezekiel, the phrase Son of Man has not yet become a specific title, but it can be seen that the phrase has made progress in the direction of becoming a title. Titles (such as the Son of Man) do not suddenly appear as titles in a culture's

vocabulary but must be preceeded by a "proto-titular" period during which the expression comes to be recognized as a title. The usage of the Son of Man in Ezekiel seems to be just such a proto-titular usage. In this book Ezekiel is called "Son of Man" over ninety times while his own name is mentioned only twice, and these only in places where specificity is required. Thus, it appears that here, Ezekiel acquires the nickname "Son of Man."

The process is carried even farther with the advent of the Similitudes of Enoch. Here it becomes apparent that the "Son of Man" has become a specific Messianic title. These Similitudes (or parables) are rich in apocalyptic imagery and Messianic concepts, from which it appears that Enoch has borrowed much from Daniel and Ezekiel. From Ezekiel 1:5 the four living creatures has a parallel in I Enoch 40:2-10. And the Messianic implications of the Son of Man in Daniel 7:13 seem to be combined with the name "Son of Man" in Ezekiel to form the Messianic title "Son of Man," in I Enoch. Even here, however, a human prophetic element cannot escape from I Enoch's view of the Son of Man since in I Enoch 70-71 Enoch himself is elevated to the office of Son of Man. These chapters will be more fully discussed later. However, it is important to note that the Messianic and the human-prophetic office are combined here in I Enoch.

There also seems to be several parallels where borrowing probably occurred from Daniel. For example the "thousand thousands" and "ten thousand times ten thousand" who stood before the ancient of days in Dan. 7:10 find their parallels in the exact same numbers who stand before the Lord of Spirits in I Enoch 40:1. Also the "ancient of days" in Dan. 7:9 with "the hair of his head like pure wool" has a parallel in

Enoch's "head of days," whose "head was white like wool" (I En. 46:1). Likewise, other elements of Daniel have close resemblances to passages in I Enoch (such as the angels Gabriel and Michael, cf. I En. 40:8-9; the scene of judgment, cf. I En. 38:1-6; and the personification of the stars, cf. I En. 43:1-2). Thus, in light of these striking similarities it is hard not to see that Daniel's "Son of Man" terminology has been made into a Messianic title in I Enoch.

The extent to which I Enoch influenced Jesus' preaching of the Son of Man is hard to determine. The question is tied up in part by the dating of the "Parables" section of the book.[62] Many scholars, relying upon the fact that the Parables section was not found among the Qumran fragments, claim that this section is post-Christian and thus discount any influence upon the New Testament. However, the evidence for dating the Parables in the latter part of the first century or later is weak. Ladd asserted:

> It seems impossible to accept the Similitudes as a Jewish Christian writing, for it lacks entirely all Christian features. Therefore we must conclude that while the date of the Similitudes is later than the rest of Enoch, it is a Jewish writing that reflects how certain Jewish circles interpreted the Danielic Son of Man in New Testament times.[63]

The question thus boils down to whether Jesus borrowed the title Son of Man directly from I Enoch, or whether he arrived at this title independently from Ezekiel and Daniel. Here it might be noted that the Similitudes use the title fifteen times, while the Gospels use it at least eighty-two times (or forty-eight times if the parallels are

---

[62] See Chapter 3, "Date, Authorship, and Eschatological Contents of Apocalyptic Books."

[63] George Eldon Ladd, Theology of the New Testament, p. 149.

excluded). Thus, the title is an important expression to both Enoch and Jesus. However, the Similitudes use another term interchangably with the Son of Man--"The Elect One." It is apparent that this phrase is synonymous with the Son of Man from several of the passages such as I Enoch 62:1-5. "The Elect One" occurs a total of sixteen times in the Similitudes. Yet, this same expression occurs only twice in the entire New Testament, at Luke 9:35 and 23:35, and the one located at Luke 9:35, has a disputed reading.[64] Furthermore, the parallels exclude these phrases and even at that, the expressions are not found on the lips of Jesus. Thus, even if Jesus did borrow the title Son of Man from Enoch, the synonym "Elect One" was not borrowed.

Finally, it should be noted that of all the verses that use "the Son of Man" only one verse could be construed to be directly dependent upon I Enoch. Matthew 19:28 reads ". . . when the Son of Man shall sit on his glorious throne . . ." While I Enoch 62:5 reads ". . . when they see that Son of Man sitting on the throne of his glory." Yet, even this parallel could have occurred by happenstance, since the context of Matthew's statement is a kingdom pericope, while in I Enoch the saying is laid in the context of the judgment. It is possible that both statements could be derivations from the idea expressed in Dan. 7:9-14. Thus, to conclude this study on the titular use of the Son of Man, there is no compelling reason to claim that Jesus depended upon Enoch for this title. However, it is hard to ignor the fact that both the Similitudes and Jesus are extremely fond of the title. Perhaps Jesus did borrow this from Enoch, but if he did it appears that the connection was remote.

Thus, in concluding this comparison between the Son of Man in

---

[64]The English Revisers placed this reading in the margin.

the apocalyptic writings with the Son of Man in the Gospels, one would have to take a rather constrained position. Evidence indicates a demonstrable link between Daniel and I Enoch and between Daniel and Jesus' Son of Man. And evidence seems to indicate some sort of link between the title in I Enoch and the title in the Gospels. But further connections concerning topics surrounding the Son of Man (such as a suffering servant, and other apocalyptic elements) are much less distinct. This is not to say that there was no influence, but to make an assertive statement is going beyond the present evidence.

As far as Jesus' use of the Son of Man terminology is concerned, Joseph Klausner has done well to capture the depth of meaning in this expression:

> By means of this title he partially divulged his messiahship but more frequently concealed it. On the one hand, he hinted that he was a simple, ordinary man (the sense conveyed by the word in everyday Aramaic speech); and on the other hand, he hinted that he too was a prophet like Ezekiel, who also had used the word. And still, further, he hinted that he was the "Son of Man" in the sense in which his contemporaries understood the expression in the Book of Daniel, and as it was explained in the Book of Enoch--the Son of Man who was to come "with the clouds of heaven" and approach "the Ancient of Days," and who was to possess the Kingdom of the King-Messiah, the everlasting Kingdom.[65]

To this explanation, one would only have to add Jesus' understanding of the Son of Man as one who would suffer and die.

Signs and Events Surrounding the Coming of the Messiah

Apocalyptic Imagery and Signs

Pictorial language and symbolic imagery characterize the eschatological appearance of the Messiah in both the Jewish apocalyptic

---

[65]Joseph Klausner, Jesus of Nazareth: His Life, Times, and Teaching, trans. Herbert Danby (New York: MacMillan, 1945), p. 257.

writings and the New Testament. These are also found somewhat in the Old Testament, though in a much smaller degree. The discussion of this section will center around the relationship between these signs and images in the Jewish apocalyptic writings and the New Testament writings. The method of investigation will be through a comparison of the texts to look for evidence of direct literary dependence and also through a comparison of similar terminology and similar motifs to look for more indirect borrowing. It may be found that the terminology encountered in the later writings was drawn from a common pool of apocalyptic language. And it may even be found that the two bodies of literature portray two analogous, yet independent developments of Old Testament themes.

One of the major themes found in connection with the coming of the Messiah is an occurrence of cataclysmic events on the earth. This is a theme that is commonly found throughout the Old Testament writings whenever a theophany occurs. Thus, when God descended upon Mount Sinai there was thunder, lightning, fire, and an earthquake accompanying the event (Ex. 19:16-18). Likewise, when God passed by Elijah, the theophany was accompanied by a great wind, fire, and an earthquake (I Kings 19:11-12). This is also a popular element found in the apocalyptic literature of the intertestamental period and in the New Testament writings which will now be examined.

Earthquakes, in particular, are a common event in the coming of the Messiah. In the "little apocalypse" of the Gospels, Jesus tells of the "signs" that will accompany his second coming. Mark reports that "there will be earthquakes in various places" (Mk. 13:8) and this is repeated by both Matthew and Luke. Similarly, in the Apocalypse of John, the earthquake motif occurs several times. In this book, it can be seen

that each occurrence of an earthquake occurs just shortly before or after the opening of the seventh seal, the blowing of the seventh trumpet, or the pouring out of the seventh bowl. If the seals, trumpets, and bowls are taken as concurrent events preceding the coming of Christ, this would apparently indicate that these earthquakes will occur just shortly before and after the second coming of Christ. At this time, "there were flashes of lightning, voices, peals of thunder, and a great earthquake such as had never been since men were on earth" (Rev. 16:17).[66] In all these cases the noun σεισμός is used. Likewise in the Septuagint the translators used σεισμός when Isaiah declared "You will be visited by the Lord of hosts with thunder and with earthquake and great noise" (Is. 29:6). Although Zechariah does not use the word "earthquake" in 14:4 the same idea is present when he tells of the Lord coming to the Mount of Olives. "The Mount of Olives shall be split in two from east to west by a very wide valley; so that one half of the Mount shall withdraw northward, and the other half southward."

However, in the Greek portions of the Jewish apocalyptic writings the verb σείω is used in passages speaking of God coming to visit the earth. Such is the case with I En. 1:3-6 which states that "The Holy and Great One will come out from his dwelling, and the eternal God will tread from there upon Mount Sinai, . . . And the high mountains will be shaken, and the high hills will be made low, and will melt like wax before the flame." Likewise I En. 102:1-2 prophesies:

> In those days if he brings a fierce fire upon you, whither will you flee, and where will you be safe? And when he utters his voice against you, will you not be terrified and afraid? And all the lights will shake with great fear, and the whole earth will be terrified and will tremble and quail.

---

[66] Cf. Rev. 6:12, 8:5, 11:13, and 11:19.

The Testament of Levi, however, uses different terminology to refer to the same theme. The Testament of Levi 4:1 speaks of "the rocks being rent" (τῶν πετρῶν σχιζομένων) when God executes his judgment upon the sons of men. This apparently refers to an earthquake since other cataclysmic events accompany the breaking of the rocks.

Later the Assumption of Moses claimed that God's "kingdom" would appear throughout all His creation "For the Heavenly One will arise from His royal throne, and he will go forth from His holy habitation" (Ass. Mos. 10:3). At that time "the earth shall tremble: to its confines shall it be shaken: and the high mountains shall be made low and the hills shall be shaken and fall" (Ass. Mos. 10:4).

II Esdras and the Apocalypse of Baruch go even farther in their discussion of earthquakes. "With IV Ezra and II Baruch we move on to the explicit description of earthquakes and similar catastrophes as 'signs,' which may be taken as indications to expect the approaching end."[67] II Esdras 9:1-4 says:

> When you see that a certain part of the predicted signs are past, then you will know that it is the very time when the Most High is about to visit the world which he has made. So when there shall appear in the world earthquakes, . . . then you will know that it was of these that the Most High spoke from the days that were of old.

The apocalypse of Baruch speaks of twelve events that will occur just prior to the coming of the Messiah. In the sixth part there will be "earthquakes and terrors" (II Bar. 27:7). "And it shall come to pass when all is accomplished that was to come to pass in those parts, that the Messiah shall then begin to be revealed" (II Bar. 29:3). II Bar.

---

[67] Lars Hartman, Prophecy Interpreted: The Formation of Some Jewish Apocalyptic Texts and of the Eschatological Discourse Mark 13 par., Coniectanea Biblica New Testament Series, No. 1 (Uppsala, Sweden: Almquist and Wiksells, 1966), p. 75.

70:1 calls this last period of time "the last black waters which are to come" when the person who "gets safe out of the war shall die in the earthquake, and whoever gets safe out of the earthquake shall be burned by the fire" (verse 8).

Of course II Esdras and the Apocalypse of Baruch are post-Christian works, yet it is obvious that they reflect an earlier Jewish theme. However a survey of this earthquake theme reveals that the connection of earthquakes with "signs" of the coming of the Messiah is closest in the post-Christian Jewish works. Here the Messiah's coming is explicitly connected with the earthquake "signs." It is likely that this new emphasis in II Esdras and the Apocalypse of Baruch is due to Christian influence, and the Christian desire for signs (Mk. 13:4).

Another event, which is common in the descriptions of the coming Messiah is the occurrence of famines. This is often closely connected with the occurrence of earthquakes. In the Old Testament, famines are often the result of God's judgment upon a particular nation or people, yet surprisingly, famines are never explicitly connected with the coming of God or the Messiah. However in the Jewish apocalyptic writings a time of trouble including a famine idea first becomes connected with the coming of God to earth. Perhaps the earliest suggestion of this can be found in the long list of woes in Jubilees 23:12-13 where famine is listed as one of the calamities that fall upon "an evil generation, which transgresses on the earth" (23:14). However, if Davenport is right verse thirteen does not refer to the eschatological future, but rather to "man's history after the flood."[68] Nevertheless, the association of famines with the coming of the Messiah seems evident in a section of the

---

[68]Davenport, Eschatology of Jubilees, p. 36.

third book of the Sibylline Oracles where eschatological woes are pronounced upon several nations. In 3:330-32, following woes to Gog and Magog, Libya is warned that "thou shalt see thy land full of dead bodies, some from war and all assaults of the devil, by famine and pestilence, and by savage-hearted foes." Along with this another possible reference might be found in the Testament of Levi 4:1. Here a reference to the earthquake motif was made by the expression "the rocks are being rent." Following this, there perhaps could be an implication of a famine accompanying this earthquake with the words "and the sun quenched, and the waters dried up." This suggests a dry, parched, and barren land with the accompanying idea of a famine.

Similarly the author of the Assumption of Moses, a contemporary of Jesus, disclosed that when God's Kingdom appears and the Heavenly One comes from his holy habitation, "the sea shall retire into the abyss, and the fountains of water shall fail, and the rivers shall dry up" (Ass. Mos. 10:6). Again, this is not an explicit reference to a famine, but a famine could be implied in this passage.

The connection between the coming of the Messiah and a famine as a sign of this event is more explicitly stated in the late Jewish apocalyptic writings. However, a famine is never specifically designated as a "sign" until after the Christian writings had made this connection explicit. In the "little apocalypse" of the Synoptic Gospels, the disciples asked Jesus "what will be the sign of your coming and of the close of the age?" (Matt. 24:3). In his answer all three Synoptic Gospels agree that along with the earthquakes "there will be famines; this is but the beginning of the birth-pangs" (Mk. 13:8). Similarly in Rev. 18:8 the eschatological judgment of "Babylon" is accompanied by a

famine.

As in the case with the earthquake theme, the later Jewish apocalypticists again seem to have stressed this famine theme as a "sign" of the coming Messiah. And here again this stress upon the signs appears to come from the Christian writings. In II Esdras the seer asks the Lord to "show thy servant the end of thy signs" (6:12). Whereupon God shows him a vision including an earthquake (6:14-16) and declares that "Sown places shall suddenly appear unsown, and full storehouses shall suddenly be found to be empty" (6:22). This is made even more obvious in the Apocalypse of Baruch where one of the twelve events accompanying the coming of the Messiah is stated to be a "famine and the withholding of rain" (Apoc. Bar. 27:7). Then, in 70:8-9 it is again decreed that there will be a famine that occurs just before the coming of the Messiah. In both of these examples the famine is again closely connected with the earthquake. Joseph Klausner has noticed that Baruch's twelve events preceding the Messiah's coming are closely paralleled by a Rabbinic tradition of a "week" (a seven year period) preceding the Messiah's arrival.[69]

> Rabbi Simeon ben Yohai said: In the week when the son of David comes, in the first year this verse will be fulfilled: "I will cause it to rain upon one city, and cause it not to rain upon another city" (Amos 4:7). In the second year the arrows of hunger will be sent forth. In the third a great famine; men, women, and children will die; . . . and at the end of the seventh year, the Son of David will come.[70]

Thus, Jewish literature at least by the late first century or early second century A.D. had included famine in its lists of signs preceding

---

[69]Joseph Klausner, The Messianic Idea in Israel: From Its Beginning to the Completion of the Mishnah, trans. W. F. Stinespring (New York: MacMillian, 1955), pp. 333-34.

[70]The Babylonian Talmud, Seder Nezikin, "Sanhedrin" 97a.

the coming of the Messiah.

Hence the famine motif appears to have gradually emerged and grown in the apocalyptic imagery from 200 B.C. to A.D. 100. Since famines are commonly associated with punishment and judgment in the O.T. prophets it is possible that famines first crept into the apocalyptic imagery through association with the final judgment. Evidence of this first appears in second century B.C. apocalyptic works although here famine played a lesser role in the final days and had not yet become recognized as an apocalyptic "sign." However, by the first century A.D. famine had become commonly joined with the apocalyptic imagery. This can be seen in the words of Jesus, the New Testament apocalypse, IV Ezra, Baruch, and in some of the Rabbinic writings.

Another detail that is commonly associated with the coming of the Messiah is fire. Fire is used in a number of ways in the Old and New Testaments and even when fire is limited to the eschatological passages, there remains a number of different usages. Here, fire is used as a metaphor to indicate purification from sin on the eschatological day of the Lord (Zech. 13:9, Mal. 3:2, 4:1). Fire is also used to describe the dreadful nature of the eternal punishment (Matt. 25:41, Mark 9:43, Rev. 19:20, 20:10).[71]

Fire, is also a characteristic trait of judgment in Jewish thought. Thus, when the Samaritans refused to receive Jesus and his disciples, James and John asked: "Lord, do you want us to bid fire come down from heaven and consume them?" (Lk. 9:54). In Rev.8:7 when the first angel blew his trumpet, "there followed hail and fire, mixed with

---

[71] I Enoch contains several descriptions of this place of punishment in such passages as I En. 10:13, 18:11, 21:7, 54:1-5, and 90:23-27.

blood, which fell on the earth; and a third of the earth was burnt up." Judgment was the purpose of the fire from heaven in Rev. 20:9. Here, Gog and Magog were gathered together to make war with the saints of the city, but "fire came down from heaven and consumed them." In this passage the author of Revelation was apparently repeating the prophecy of Ezekiel 38:21-22 and 39:6 where the same nations (Gog and Magog) are prophesied to have fire and brimstone rain down upon them. But even Ezekiel seems to be appealing to an earlier theme in Jewish thought. This characteristic of Judgment is first revealed in Gen. 19:24 when "the Lord rained on Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven." Other examples of heavenly fire occur in Elijah's lifetime at the incident at Carmel (I Kings 18:38) and when he called down fire from heaven to destroy one hundred men (II Kings 1:9-12).

It is not surprising to find this same theme in the Jewish apocalyptic passages which give visions of the eschatological judgment and coming Messiah. The Sibylline Oracles follow this pattern when in 5:377-78 the seer announced that in the last days "fire shall rain on mortal men from the fields of heaven, fire and blood, water, meteor, and darkness, heaven's night."[72] II Esdras 13:1-11 departs slightly from the aforementioned scheme in that here the fire issues forth not from heaven, but from the Son of Man's mouth.

> He sent forth from his mouth as it were a stream of fire, and from his lips a flaming breath, and from his tongue he shot forth a storm of sparks. All these were mingled together, . . . and fell on the onrushing multitude which was prepared to fight, and burned them all up (II Esdras 13:10-11).

This could have been derived from Isaiah 11:4 where it is said that the

---

[72]Other references to this motif which are connected with the coming eschaton are found in I En. 102:1, II Esdras 13:10-11, and Apoc. Baruch 27:10 and 70:8.

shoot from the stump of Jesse (the Messiah) "shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips he shall slay the wicked."[73] Also since II Esdras was probably written in the late first century it is possible that II Esdras 13:10-11 could be reflecting Revelation 19:15.

And finally fire is a common feature of theophanies in the apocalyptic writings as well as in the Old and New Testaments. This can be seen in Old Testament historical theophanies such as at Sinai (Ex. 19:16-18) and in the column of fire that led Israel at night (Ex. 13:21-22) as well as in Old Testament prophecies of the Day of the Lord such as in Joel 2:30. In this last passage Joel claims that fire is one of the signs of the day of the Lord: "I will give portents in the heavens and on the earth, blood and fire and columns of smoke. The sun shall be turned to darkness, and the moon to blood, before the great and terrible day of the Lord comes."

In Daniel 7:9-11 the vision of the Ancient of Days on his throne is accompanied by a river of fire flowing out before him. This passage was undoubtedly a major influence upon Enoch's heavenly vision of the "Great Glory" seated on the throne with streams of fire (I En. 14:9-22) and the New Testament apocalypse's visions of heaven (Rev. 15:1-2, cf. 4:5-6). And in II Thess. 1:7 it is stated that the Lord Jesus will be "revealed from heaven with his mighty angels in flaming fire." At any rate the New Testament writers did not need the apocalyptic writings for this component of their eschatology and no New Testament passage displays any direct literary dependence upon these writings.

---

[73] Cf. Isaiah 33:11, Hosea 6:5, I Enoch 62:2, and Psalms of Solomon 17:27 and 35.

Frequently disturbances in the Sun, Moon, and Stars accompany the eschatological day of the Lord. The earliest examples of this can be seen in Joel 2:1-11, 30-32 and Isaiah 13:9-10, where it is said that "the stars of the heavens and their constellations will not give their lights, the sun will be dark at its rising and the moon will not shed its light" (Is. 13:10). Both the Jewish apocalyptic writings and the Christian writings refer to this same theme.

Of the Jewish apocalyptic writings the Assumption of Moses 10:5 comes closest to an actual quote of Isaiah or Joel. As it stands in the Latin text, the parallel is not exact. However, if R. H. Charles' alteration of the word order is correct, the parallel is remarkable: "the sun shall be broken and he shall be turned into darkness; and the moon shall not give her light, and be turned wholly into blood. And the circle of the stars shall be disturbed."[74] Other Jewish apocalyptic parallels are less exact.[75]

The Christian parallels, on the other hand, are much more precise. Acts 2:16-21 actually goes so far as to quote Joel, and Mark 13:24-25 says "the sun will be darkened, and the moon will not give its light, and the stars will be falling from heaven."[76] Thus, here it appears to be unnecessary to suggest that Christianity was borrowing from Jewish apoca-

---

[74]Charles, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, II, 422.

[75]Cf. I Enoch 21:3-6, Testament of Levi 4:1, Sibylline Oracles 3:80-92, and II Esdras 5:4-5. Enoch speaks only of seven burning stars in the heavens, the Testament of Levi tells of the sun being quenched, the Sibylline Oracles claim that the heavens will be rolled up and that the heavenly luminaries will be removed from the sky, and II Esdras asserts that the sun shall shine in the night, the moon will shine in the day, and the stars will change their positions.

[76]Cf. Matthew 24:29, Luke 21:25, and Revelation 6:12 and 8:12.

lyptic material for its imagery of signs in the sun, moon, and stars. Instead, the Christian writings show direct dependence upon the Old Testament.

In concluding this section on the apocalyptic imagery and signs surrounding the coming of the Messiah it becomes apparent that the New Testament writings are to a certain extent dependent and to a greater extent independent of the Jewish apocalyptic writers. And on the other hand it appears likely that the Jewish writings were also to a certain extent dependent and independent of the Christian writings. As far as the Christian writings are concerned the main apocalyptic themes ultimately come from the Old Testament writings. However, the Christian writings are indebted to the Jewish Apocalypticists for a renewed emphasis upon eschatological visions and imagery. And in some cases the New Testament writers appear to follow the lead suggested by the earlier apocalypticists in re-directing Old Testament themes. Such is probably the case in the eschatological famines where the O.T. commonly associates famines with divine judgment. However, in the Jewish Apocalyptic writings and in the Christian writings famines have become part of the eschatological imagery.

Opposition to the Messiah and His People

Tribulation and wars would be included in the above discussion on signs and events surrounding the coming of the Messiah, but these troubles are such a large part of the Messiah's coming they will be treated separately. Roughly speaking these distresses can be divided into three groups: tribulations (or hard times) in general, wars in general, and wars against the Messiah and his people in particular. Of course there is a certain amount of overlap here as tribulations are

often mixed in with the hazards of war and since the war against the Messiah and his followers is often included in the larger category of "wars."

A common feature in the O.T. prophets is the announcement of impending judgment upon Israel or Judah as a result of their sins. This judgment most often came in the form of war and eventually the Jewish people ended up in the Assyrian and Babylonian exiles as a result of divine judgment. However, war was not the only expression of divine judgment. At other times this judgment came in the form of tribulations such as droughts, famines, and locust plagues. In the book of Daniel however, this tribulation theme took on aspects of religious persecution. Thus, Daniel spoke of the "little horn" who magnified himself exceedingly and cast down some of the host of heaven and overthrew the sanctuary (8:9-12). Nevertheless, Daniel remained in the prophetic stream of thought, in that he still considered this persecution to be the result of the people's sins. In 9:13-14 Daniel confessed:

> As it is written in the law of Moses, all this calamity has come upon us, yet we have not entreated the favor of the Lord our God, turning from our iniquities and giving heed to thy truth. Therefore the Lord has kept ready the calamity and has brought it upon us.

This persecution theme begins to shift somewhat in the later Jewish apocalyptic writings. Here the persecution that is endured by the people is <u>not</u> the result of their sins. Instead, the Jews are seen as the righteous people of God who are suffering under the unrighteous pagans. I Enoch 46:8-47:2 charged that these pagan kings "manifest unrighteousness" when

> they persecute the houses of His congregations, and the faithful who hang upon the name of the Lord of Spirits. And in those days shall have ascended the prayer of the righteous and the blood of the righteous from the earth before the Lord of Spirits. And in those days the holy ones who dwell above in the heavens shall unite with

> one voice . . . on behalf of the blood of the righteous which has been shed . . . that they may not have to suffer for ever.

Similarly, the author of the Assumption of Moses claimed that a king would arise

> who shall crucify those who confess to their circumcision. . . . And they shall likewise be forced by those who torture them to enter their inmost sanctuary, and they shall be forced by goads to blaspheme with insolence the word, finally after these things the laws and what they had above their altar (Ass. Moses 8:1-5).

Corresponding to this "persecution for righteousness' sake" theme, the New Testament writings portray the same viewpoint concerning the eschatological tribulation. Matthew 24:9 says "they will deliver you up to tribulation, and put you to death, and you will be hated by all nations for my name's sake." Also in Rev. 6:9 the seer declared: "I saw under the altar the souls of those who had been slain for the word of God and for the witness they had born." This persecution theme undoubtedly stems from the inherent incompatibility of the Judeo-Christian gospel with the sinful nature of the world and thus persecution can be expected in all ages. However, the apocalyptic and Christian writers have emphasized a concentrated outpouring of persecution surrounding the coming of the Messiah. This climaxes with the coming of an anti-christ figure who, as the book of Revelation claims, blasphemed God and "was allowed to make war on the saints and to conquer them" (Rev. 13:7). Thus, it appears that the N.T. writers have agreed with the apocalyptic idea that the people of God will be persecuted prior to the coming of the Messiah.

Mixed in with many of these tribulation themes, the coming of the Messiah is often pictured as a time when many peoples and nations rise up against one another. The Sibylline Oracle 5:361-62 asserted that "there shall be at the last time about the waning of the moon, a world-

convulsing war deceitful in guilefulness." The idea of wars accompanying the end times was maintained earlier in the tenth and eleventh chapters of Daniel. This apparently was the origin of the statements in the "little apocalypse" of the Gospels. Matthew 24:15 appeals directly to Daniel as the source for the "desolating sacrilege" so it is likely that the statements in verses six and seven likewise came from Daniel: "And you will hear of wars and rumors of wars; see that you are not alarmed; for this must take place, but the end is not yet. For nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom." II Esdras 13:31-32 contains a statement that is closely parallel with this section in Matthew:

> They shall plan to make war against one another, city against city, place against place, people against people, and kingdom against kingdom. And when these things come to pass and the signs occur which I showed you before, then my son will be revealed, whom you saw as a man coming up from the sea.

The book of Revelation made a further reference to this theme when the second seal was broken: "Out came another horse, bright red; its rider was permitted to take peace from the earth, so that men should slay one another; and he was given a great sword" (Rev. 6:4). This comes to a climax later in Revelation 9:13-16 where it is said that one third of mankind is killed by an army of two hundred million cavalry.

In several passages this eschatological war theme is narrowed to one particular war in which the nations of the world rise up against the Messiah and his people. This is seen as early as Isaiah where a multitude of all the nations rise up against the mountain of God (Ariel) in Is. 29:1-8. At that time in an instant they will suddenly be "visited by the Lord of hosts with thunder and with earthquake and great noise, with whirlwind and tempest, and the flame of a devouring fire" (Is. 29:6). Later writers in the Old Testament give very similar pictures of this

"day of the Lord" and these writers sometimes agree right down to such details as the earthquakes and fire.[77]

The Jewish apocalyptic writers likewise reveal similar characteristics to Isaiah's prophecy of the day of the Lord. I Enoch 90:1-24 symbolically represented the nations of the world by eagles, vultures, ravens, and kites who "all came together and helped one another in order to dash that horn of the ram in pieces" (I En. 90:16). Here the horn apparently refers to the leader of the Jews during these last days. Similar to this is Jubilees 23:17-31 where God will raise up "the sinners of the Gentiles" to make war with the Jews "and much blood shall be shed upon the earth" (Jub. 23:23). Later God will strengthen his people and they will drive out their adversaries (Jub. 23:30).[78]

In the Christian writings the Synoptic apocalypses (Matt. 24, Mark 13, and Luke 21) do not explicitly mention any war against the Messiah and his people. However, this theme could be referred to in the sections that speak of fleeing to the mountains because of the "great tribulation" (Matt. 24:15-21). Nevertheless, the book of Revelation makes this theme obvious. Here John claimed: "I saw the beast and the kings of the earth with their armies gathered to make war against him who sits upon the horse and against his army" (Rev. 19:19). Consequently the one who sits upon the horse (Christ) destroys the beast and his armies. However, a thousand years later the power behind the beast (Satan) is released from a pit, whereupon he gathers together Gog and Magog to fight against the saints of God. But, before they could do any-

---

[77]Cf. Ezekiel 38:14-39:6, Zechariah 14:2-14, and Daniel 9:26.

[78]Other passages in Jewish apocalyptic writings include: Sibylline Oracles 3:663-701, Testament of Dan 5:4-6 and II Esdras 13:5-12.

thing "fire came down from heaven and consumed them" (Rev. 20:9).

The theme of war against the Messiah and his followers is therefore found to be an important part of the Old Testament eschatological writings, the Jewish intertestamental apocalypses, and the New Testament writings. Apparently the later Jewish apocalypses and the New Testament writers depended upon the Old Testament for the origin of their ideas. The same can also be said for the entire theme "tribulation and wars." As it was discussed above, these events were expected to occur in the last days by Jewish and Christian writers from the Old Testament prophetic period through the Christian era. Still, it is possible to trace some development in these themes as they progressed through time.

The Names of the Messiah

The first section of this chapter discussed the use of the name "Son of Man" as it came to be applied to the Messiah. This section will investigate the use of several other names that have been used to refer to the Messiah.

The expression "Son of God" in the Old Testament is used in several ways. In Genesis 6:4 the phrase apparently refers to god-like (or angelic) beings who mated with the daughters of men. In Exodus 4:22 the statement is made by God that "Israel is my first-born son." Ladd asserted that this use of the Son of God is "to describe the relationship men may sustain to God as the peculiar objects of his loving care."[79]

Many other statements in the O.T., however, are debated. In II Samuel 7:12-14, God said to David: "I will raise up your offspring after you, who shall come forth from your body, and I will establish his

---

[79]Ladd, Theology of the New Testament, p. 160.

kingdom. . . . I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be his father, and he shall be my son." Similarly in Psalm 2:7 the Lord says to his annointed "You are my son, today I have begotten you." Otto Michel claimed that this is a Royal Psalm and that the references in II Sam. 7:14 and Ps. 2:7 both refer to the Jewish king, with whom God has now established a relationship. "The words, 'He said to me, "You are my Son; I myself have begotten you today,"' therefore belong to an original coronation ritual, as the 'today' clearly shows."[80] Sherman Johnson explained that "The thought is that God has created and chosen the nation and its leader, who stand in a relation of filial dependence and obedience to God."[81]

However there is no good reason why these passages could not have originally referred to the Messiah. This is the position of Ladd who believes that "while there is an Old Testament background for messianic sonship, the expression Son of God never became a familiar messianic designation."[82] In fact the expression only occurs in Jewish literature one time before the first century A.D. (I Enoch 105:2) and this reference is disputed. Nevertheless, Psalm 2 can be interpreted Messianically. The term "his annointed" in verse two is the Hebrew מְשִׁיחוֹ (Messiah) which can refer to either the king or to the future "annointed one." The

---

[80]Otto Michel, "Son of God," The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology, ed. Colin Brown (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publ. House, 1978), III, 637.

[81]Sherman E. Johnson, "Son of God," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, ed. George Arthur Buttrick (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), IV, 408-9.

[82]Ladd, Theology of the New Testament, p. 161.

rabbis generally treated this Psalm messianically.[83] And in the Psalms of Solomon 17:26 a reference is made to Psalm 2:9 which is interpreted messianically. Thus, since verses seven and nine in the second Psalm both refer to the same person, the author of the Psalms of Solomon considered the "son" of verse seven to be the Messiah. Another O.T. passage that seems to make a similar reference to a messianic Son of God is Is. 9:6: "For to us a child is born, to us a son is given; and the government will be upon his shoulder, and his name will be called 'Wonderful Counselor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace.'" But some have interpreted this as referring to a future king who will bring peace to the people.[84] However a reference to a future king such as "Mighty God" can only refer to a divine king rather than a human one.

Regarding the Qumran writings Donald Guthrie indicated that "There is little doubt that Ps. 2:7 was read and expounded in a Messianic sense at Qumran. . . . Both Ps. 2:7 and II Sam. 7:14 were used messianically in 4QFlor."[85] After quoting from II Sam. 7:11-14, 4Q Florilegium 1:11-13 commented that "my son" is

> the Branch of David who shall arise with the interpreter of the Law to rule in Zion at the end of time. As it is written, I will raise up the tent of David that is fallen (Amos 9:11). That is to say, the fallen tent of David is he who shall arise to save Israel.

Concerning the Jewish apocalyptic writings, reference has already been made to the view of the author of the Psalms of Solomon. Another possible allusion to a Son of God occurs in I Enoch 105:2 where God

---

[83] See Midrash Tehillim on Psalm 2:7 and The Babylonian Talmud, Seder Moed, "Sukkah," 52a.

[84] Michel, p. 637.

[85] Donald Guthrie, New Testament Theology (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1981), p. 237.

makes reference to "I and my Son." However several scholars have questioned whether this was originally a part of this section of Enoch.[86] The messianic reference here seems out of place and is the only messianic reference in I En. 91-104. Furthermore, in the Greek fragments of Enoch that have survived, chapter 105 is missing.

II Esdras refers to "my Son" in several passages such as II Esdras 7:28,29; 13:32,37,52; and 14:9. However Johnson thought that this could be due to Christian interpolations.[87] Others claim that the term underlying this expression could be the Hebrew עבד and thus the correct translation may be "servant" rather than "son."[88] Along this line the apocalypse of Baruch 70:9 uses the term "my servant" rather than "my Son."

In the Gospels, the evangelists themselves call Jesus the Son of God but Jesus never uses the full expression "Son of God" to refer to himself. In the light of the preceeding discussion it appears that "the Son of God" had not yet become a messianic title by Jesus' time. However the fact that the evangelists and other N.T. writers use the expression so frequently seems to indicate that it became a messianic title shortly afterwards. Nevertheless Jesus frequently referred to himself as "the Son" and his statements make it clear that he considered himself to be in a unique filial relationship with God the Father. Thus in Matt. 11:27 (parallel Lk. 10:22) Jesus says "All things have been delivered to me by my Father; and no one knows the Son except the Father, and no one knows

---

[86]Michael A. Knibb, The Ethiopic Book of Enoch (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), II, 243.

[87]Johnson, "Son of God," Interpreters Dictionary, IV, 409.

[88]Ladd, Theology of the New Testament, p. 162.

the Father except the Son and any one to whom the Son chooses to reveal him."

Jesus also frequently referred to God as "Father." G. E. Ladd noticed that "In the O.T. God is occasionally thought of as Father, but the term is usually used of God's relationship to Israel as a people, not of His relationship to the individual."[89] Furthermore, "In intertestamental Judaism, 'Father' appears only infrequently" and in the literature of Palestinian Judaism, God is never addressed as "Father" in prayers (although in the literature of Hellenistic Judaism God is sometimes addressed as "Father").[90] Yet in all of Jesus' sixteen prayers (twenty-one including parallels), God is referred to as Father, with the exception of Mk. 15:34 and its parallel in Matt. 27:46. Furthermore, it is interesting to note that Jesus used the Aramaic word abba to refer to God. Jeremias' studies concluded that abba was an endearing term used by children to refer to their fathers, equivalent to "daddy."[91] This was an intimate term which the Jews apparently avoided in reference to God because it would appear to be an irreverent address for God. In fact Jeremias claims that "We do not have a single example of God being addressed as abba in Judaism but Jesus always addressed God in this way in his prayers."[92] The fact that abba occurs three times in the N.T. (Mk. 14:36, Rom. 8:15, and Gal. 4:6) in a transliterated form rather than

---

[89]George Eldon Ladd, "God the Father: New Testament," The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1982), II, 510.

[90]Ibid.

[91]Joachim Jeremias, The Prayers of Jesus (Naperville, IL: Alec R. Allenson, 1967), p. 59.

[92]Joachim Jeremias, The Proclamation of Jesus, Vol. I, New Testament Theology (London: SCM Press, 1971), p. 66.

in a translated form indicates that this is an instance of an Aramaic word which became used so often that a translation was no longer necessary.

Thus, from the preceding discussion, it appears quite certain that the Jewish apocalyptic writings had little or no effect upon the New Testament use of the Son of God. Instead it appears that the roots of this idea stem from the O.T. Otto Michel asserted that "Its close connexion with the confession of Jesus as Messiah suggests that this sonship refers back to II Sam. 7:12,14."[93] And Sherman Johnson goes so far as to say that the Gospels are in contrast with the Jewish literature since they emphasize the point that the Messiah is also Son of God."[94]

In the Gospels Jesus is sometimes given the messianic designation "Son of David." But this expression is seldom found in the sayings of Jesus themselves. An exception to this is found in Mark 12:35-37 where Jesus raises the question "How can the scribes say that the Christ is the Son of David? . . . David himself calls him Lord; so how is he his son?" Leonhard Goppelt suggested that this ascription was first applied to Jesus as a result of the early church's reworking of Mark 12.

> It is possible that this understanding of the early Palestinian church had its beginnings in comments of Jesus that were developed beyond their form in the pericope of Mk. 12. In the words of Jesus about his sending, at any rate, the expectation of the Davidic king of salvation played no role.[95]

It is true that this expression probably had no part in the preaching of Jesus, but this should not be construed to mean that the Son of David had

---

[93]Michel, "Son of God," New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology, III, 639.

[94]Johnson, "Son of God," Interpreter's Dictionary, IV, 409.

[95]Leonhard Goppelt, Theology of the New Testament, trans. John E. Alsup (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1981), I, 168.

no part in Jesus' messianic consciousness. Mark 12 shows that Jesus certainly understood the Messiah to come from the line of David. Of the fifteen times in the Gospels when the expression Son of David is used, it is used eleven times by others who call Jesus by this phrase. Yet, Jesus never denied this Messianic title. Perhaps he consciously avoided using this expression because of the political overtones that it would create. Surely the Jewish people in Jesus' days understood this expression messianically. For example, in Matthew 12:23 after Jesus performed several healings "all the people were amazed, and said, 'can this be the Son of David?'" Two things in this passage point toward the fact that this expression had become a messianic title by Jesus' time. First, it should be noted that the article accompanies "Son of David." This points to a particular Son of David--probably the Messiah. And secondly, the reaction of the Pharisees to the people's statement indicates that they understood the expression to be a messianic designation: "When the Pharisees heard it they said, 'it is only by Beelzebul, the prince of demons, that this man casts out demons'" (Matt. 12:24). Also, if this expression was just a development of the early church, it is hard to explain why the expression is never again used outside of the Synoptics (although phrases such as "seed of David" and "root of David" do occur in a few N.T. references). Thus, it remains to be seen where this expression originated.

The earliest reference to this Son of David theme appears in II Sam. 7:12-14 where Yahweh promised to raise up David's offspring and "establish the throne of his kingdom forever." Later the prophets continued to reiterate this idea. In Isaiah 9:6-7 the prophet told of a child that would be born

and his name will be called "Wonderful Counselor, Mighty God, Ever-

> lasting Father, Prince of Peace." Of the increase of his government and of peace there will be no end, upon the throne of David, and over his Kingdom, to establish it, and to uphold it with justice and with righteousness from this time forth and for evermore.

Similarly Jeremiah prophesied saying

> Behold, the days are coming, says the Lord, when I will fulfil the promise I made to the house of Israel and the house of Judah. In those days and at that time I will cause a righteous Branch to spring forth for David; and he shall execute justice and righteousness in the land (Jer. 33:14-15).

In the Jewish apocalyptic writings allusions to the messianic Son of David are found in the Psalms of Solomon 17:5 and 23 and II Esdras 12:32. Also possible references to this idea may be found in the Sibylline Oracles 3:386-90 and in the Testament of Benjamin 9:3.[96]

Psalm of Solomon 17:5 said "Thou, O Lord, didst choose David to be king over Israel, and didst swear unto him touching his seed for ever, that his kingdom should not fail before thee." This apparently refers to the promise made by God to David in II Sam. 7:12-14 where God said he would raise up David's offspring and "will establish the throne of his kingdom for ever" (II Sam. 7:13). The language of Ps. Sol. 17:5 is even similar to other references to this promise in the Psalms. In particular, the Septuagint's translation of Ps. 89:3-4 (found in LXX 88:4-5) is closely parallel to the Greek of Ps. Sol. 17:5. Similarly, when Ps. Sol. 17:23 says: "Behold, O Lord, and raise up unto them their king, the Son of David, in the time which thou, O God, knowest," this, likewise, is closely parallel to the Septuagint translation of Jeremiah 30:9 (found in LXX 37:9). If these references are true instances in which the Psalms of Solomon borrowed from the O.T., then it follows that the II Sam. 7:12-14 and related passages have been messianically inter-

---

[96] Other intertestamental references to the Son of David motif can be found in I Macc. 2:57 and Sirach 47:11,22.

preted at least since the latter half of the first century B.C.

Thus, it appears relatively certain that this theme can be traced far back into Judaism. As it has been already mentioned, II Sam. 7:12-14 seems to be the origin of the Son of David theme. Another early reference to this messianic--Davidic son theme can be found in Amos 9:11 which prophesies: "In that day I will raise up the booth of David that is fallen and repair its breaches." Other references can be found in the Psalms (132:11-12), Ezekiel (34:23 and 37:25), and Hosea (3:5).

However a Messianic lineage extending from David is not the universal testimony of the intertestamental Jewish literature. In several passages of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs reference is made to a Messiah who comes from the tribe of Levi. As the text now stands references are made throughout the Testaments concerning a Messiah from Levi and a Messiah from Judah. However, R. H. Charles claimed that the references to the Messiah from Judah are later additions.[97]

According to Charles the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs in its original form was written "between 153, when Jonathan the Maccabee assumed the high-priesthood, and the year of the breach of Hyrcanus with the Pharisees."[98] This is based upon references such as the Testament of Reuben 6:10-11 which refers to a High Priest who is also a king. This only occurred in Judaism after Jonathan combined these offices. However the ascension of a Levitical kingly line (the Hasmonean Kings) had caused the writer of the Testaments to re-evaluate the belief of a messianic king from the tribe of Judah. The end product of this

---

[97]R. H. Charles, "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, II, 294.

[98]Ibid., p. 289.

reevaluation of messianic beliefs resulted in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs with its belief in a Messiah from the tribe of Levi. "We have here the attestation of a remarkable revolution in the Jewish expectations of the Messiah. For some thirty or forty years the hope of a Messiah from Judah was abandoned in favour of a Messiah from Levi."[99] However this new belief probably did not last too long. In the reign of John Hyrcanus a dispute between the Pharisees and Hyrcanus resulted in the king shifting his loyalties from the party of the Pharisees to the party of the Sadducees. With this shift it suddenly became apparent that the Messiah would not come from the Levitical line. Charles asserted that "with the breach of Hyrcanus with the Pharisees this hope was abandoned, and so we find that in the first century additions the hope of a Messiah from Judah reappears (T. Jud. 24:5-6, T. Naph. 4:5)."[100] Later more additions were incorporated into the work by Christians who adopted the work and then reworked the Testaments giving it a Christian flavor. Thus, the current Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs is a hodgepodge of at least three layers, and within this work lies the doctrine of two Messiahs--one from Levi and one from Judah.

Further evidence for the belief in two Messiahs has come from the documents of Qumran. In The Community Rule (1QS 9:11) it is said that the "men of holiness" will be "ruled by the primitive precepts in which the men of the community were first instructed until there shall come the prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel." Geza Vermes said that "The Community Rule is probably one of the oldest documents of the sect; its original composition may date from the latter part of the second

---

[99]Ibid., p. 294.

[100]Ibid.

century B.C."[101] Thus, this document corresponds well with the period of time in which Charles claimed that the Testaments was first composed. Also the Damascus Document, which was discovered in 1897 in Cairo,[102] shows familiarity with this belief in two Messiahs. CD 12:23-13:1 speaks of "the coming of the Messiah of Aaron and Israel." Vermes suggested that this document "was written in about 100 B.C."[103] Thus, this document also roughly corresponds with the reign of John Hyrcanus, who died about 104 B.C.

Another manuscript of The Community Rule found at Qumran omits 9:11 and the doctrine of two Messiahs. This has led J. Starcky to conclude that

> in the earliest Hellenistic period (C. 200-150 B.C.) (when 1QS circulated in this non-messianic form) there was a total eclipse of messianism at Qumran. It was re-awakened in the Hasmonaean period (C. 160-50 B.C.) with a doctrine of a sacerdotal and a secular Messiah.[104]

This all lends support to Charles' theory that the Messiah from the tribe of Levi arose around the time of Jonathan and then later gradually disappeared. In this sense the New Testament owes nothing to this intertestamental literature. However it is possible that the author of the book of Hebrews has a polemic against this view when he argues for the superiority of the priesthood of Melchizedek over that of Aaron.

---

[101] Geza Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English (2d ed.; New York: Penguin Books, 1975), p. 71.

[102] William Sanford LaSor, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1972), pp. 32-33. Discoveries of this document at Qumran lead to the conclusion that the work originated within the Qumran community.

[103] Vermes, p. 95.

[104] J. Starcky, "Les quatre etapes du messianisme a Qumran," Revue Biblique, LXX (1963), pp. 481-505, cited by Schürer, II, 551.

In Hebrews 6:20 it is stated that Jesus has "become a high priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek." The author of Hebrews then argues that Christ's new priesthood (although it is of the old order of Melchizedek) is a higher priesthood than that of the Levites. Speaking of Melchizedek, Hebrews 7:4-10 said:

> See how great he is! Abraham the patriarch gave him a tithe of the spoils. . . . this man who has not their genealogy received tithes from Abraham and blessed him who had the promises. It is beyond dispute that the inferior is blessed by the superior. . . . One might even say that Levi himself, who receives tithes, paid tithes through Abraham, for he was still in the loins of his ancestor when Melchizedek met him.

And later it is stated that "it is evident that our Lord was descended from Judah, and in connection with that tribe Moses said nothing about priests" (Heb. 7:14).

The descendant of Judah, which came through David was said to be a king whom God would establish upon the throne for ever (II Sam. 7: 13). However it was the Levitical line that was established to be priests unto God (Ex. 40:12-16). But later the Davidic line of kings disappeared with the exile. And then in the intertestamental period Levitical kings (the Hasmonean Kings) re-established the Jewish state and even combined priestly functions with the monarchy. It is likely that this was the time when some Jewish theologians wrote about a Messiah from the tribe of Levi. If the author of Hebrews was familiar with this material, then it may just be that this section in Hebrews is a rebuttal of this position. Here in chapters five through seven, it is already implied that Christ is the Messianic King of the O.T. This is evident from 5:5 where the author appeals to the second Psalm (with its emphasis on a Messianic King). However Hebrews goes beyond this Messianic King idea and proclaims Christ as the Messianic priest as well. This is stated

in the following verse (5:6), which is a quote from Psalm (110:4). LaSor likewise admitted the possibility of Hebrews borrowing material from these Qumran documents: "it is possible that the author of Hebrews was reacting against an emphasis on the Aaronic priesthood, such as that of Qumran, by stressing the superiority of the 'Melchizedek' priesthood of Christ."[105] Thus, the fifth through the seventh chapters of Hebrews could be intended to dispute statements of the Qumran sect such as 1QS 9:11 and CD 12:23-13:1.

The discovery and publication of a Melchizedek document found at Qumran (XI Q Melchizedek) has led many scholars to the conclusion that Hebrews was greatly influenced by this work. Vermes indicated that "This manuscript sheds valuable light not only on the Melkizedek figure of the Epistle to the Hebrews 7, but also on the development of the messianic concept in the New Testament and early Christianity."[106] This may be so, since Melchizedek is only mentioned in the Bible in Genesis 14:18 and in Psalms 110:4, besides those references in Hebrews 5-7. Thus, XI Q Melchizedek has become a fourth document reflecting a Melchizedek tradition. Yet two other Qumran documents may indirectly reflect a Melchizedek tradition. One fragment (4Q 280-2) seems to reflect an anti-Messiah tradition. Here God's opponent is called Melkiresha (meaning "my king is wickedness") which appears to be a paronomasia on Melchizedek (which means "my king is righteousness!").[107] The other document is a damaged text entitled "The Testament of Amram." Here a certain son of darkness is said to have three names--one of which is Melkiresha (mentioned

---

[105]LaSor, p. 184.

[106]Vermes, p. 266.

[107]Ibid., pp. 252-54.

above). Opposed to this figure is a son of light who is likewise said to have three names. It is likely that Melchizedek was one of them.[108] Thus, it appears that the Qumran Community was quite familiar with Melchizedek.

Nevertheless, even if the author of Hebrews was familiar with the Qumran literature and the Melchizedek figure, it is quite another thing to say that Hebrew's concept of Christ as the priest after the order of Melchizedek was dependent upon Qumran's concept. Donald Guthrie has observed that there are major differences in the way that Hebrews and XI Q Melchizedek use this figure:

> Although there are some similarities between 11Q Melchizedek and Hebrews, there are more major differences. In 11Q, Melchizedek is a warrior saviour, not a priest. He is moreover a heavenly creature, whereas in Hebrews he is a human person. The 11Q Melchizedek is related to levitical laws, unlike the presentation of a non-levitical high priest in Hebrews. Moreover, 11Q does not allude, as Hebrews does, to either Gn. 14 or Ps. 110.[109]

It seems best to agree with Guthrie in saying "His exposition is based on Psalm 110, which itself goes back to the Genesis account."[110] Yet even with this position, it is quite likely that the inclusion of Hebrews 5-7 in the book was occasioned by the Aaronic or Levitical Messiahs found in the Qumran writings and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.

The name "Messiah" comes from the Old Testament word <u>מָשִׁיחַ</u> meaning "anointed" or "anointed one." In two instances in the New Testament this name has been transliterated into the Greek characters <u>μεσσίας</u> (John 1:41 and 4:25). Thus, by N.T. times it appears likely that the word "Messiah" had become such a commonly understood expression

---

[108] Ibid., pp. 260-61.

[109] Donald Guthrie, <u>New Testament Theology</u>, p. 484.

[110] Ibid., p. 483.

that it could be simply transliterated and still be readily understood by N.T. listeners. Nevertheless, outside of these two exceptions the term is always translated by the Greek Χριστός, which carries the same meaning.

In the O.T. anointing was a common practice in the consecration ceremonies of priests (Ex. 30:30) and kings (I Sam. 10:1). K. H. Rengstorf noted that the background for this practice was an ancient oriental custom and was "associated with the gift and with the solemn ritual transfer of authority, power and honour. The anointing gave the one anointed a position of power and the right to exercise it."[111] Thus even pagan kings, such as Cyrus (Is. 45:1) can be called the Lord's anointed. "God's anointed is thus dependent on God as well as integrated into his plan in obedience to his will."[112] Israel's kings were rulers who were commissioned to rule in God's behalf. However, these rulers never quite fulfilled the office ideally. J. Jocz claimed that "The Messianic hope was born from the recognition that no human king is able to fulfill the high ideal."[113] Thus,

> If God's purpose is not to be defeated, the true Messiah (= king) as God's authentic servant is the only answer. In Hebrew categories the remedy is centered upon a person and not upon an abstract doctrine or an ideal system. There can be no Messianic kingdom without God's anointed king.[114]

Even though the roots of this idea extend back to the anointed kings of Israel, it is questionable whether or not the expression "the

---

[111] Karl Heinrich Rengstorf, "Christos," The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology, II, 336.

[112] Ibid.

[113] Jakob Jocz, "Messiah," The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible, IV, 200.

[114] Ibid.

anointed one" or "Messiah" ever became a term denoting an eschatological divine figure. Franz Hesse asserted that

> A definitely Messianic or eschatological understanding cannot be presupposed when the king is called מְשִׁיחַ יְהוָה. All the references are to the present king or a past king. Epigrammatically, one might say that none of the Messianic passages in the OT can be exegeted Messianically. Nevertheless, the so-called Messianic understanding is implied in many of the passages, although this is more evident in texts in which the term מָשִׁיחַ is not used.[115]

However, this conclusion is disputed by some scholars. Victor Hamilton looking into the "royal psalms" concluded that many of these Psalms, including Psalm 2 "may be regarded legitimately as messianic, even though some may refer initially to Israel's monarch."[116] It is even claimed that some of these Psalms can not refer to a Davidic king but must refer to the divine eschatological king. Such is the case with Psalm 45 where it is said of the anointed king "Your divine throne endures for ever and ever" (Ps. 45:6). Hamilton also believes that

> The repeated claim that mashiah in the OT never refers to an eschatological figure, the Messiah, hinges also for its validity on the interpretation of Dan 9:26. While some hold that the anointed one (mashiah) "who is to be cut off" was Onias III (deposed as high priest 175 B.C.), there is strong warrant on the basis of the context (v. 24) to regard the mashiah as none other than Jesus Christ."[117]

Whatever the case may be, scholars generally agree that the eschatological Messiah is suggested in the OT even though the title "Messiah" has not yet become popular in its literature.

The popularization of "Messiah" as an eschatological figure probably occurred during the intertestamental period. A possible early

---

[115]Franz Hesse, "Χρίω, Χριστός" Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, IX, 504.

[116]Victor P. Hamilton, "Anointed, anointed one," Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament, eds. R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer, Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke (Chicago: Moody Press, 1980), I, 531.

[117]Ibid.

reference to an eschatological anointed one can be found in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, where the Testament of Reuben 6:8 speaks of Levi who "shall sacrifice for all Israel until the consummation of the times, as the anointed High Priest, of whom the Lord spake." However, here "the anointed one" has not yet become a title which can stand on its own and as far as M. de Jonge is concerned "the passage has to be understood against a Christian background."[118]

The Similitudes of Enoch also contain a couple of allusions to the Messiah (or Anointed One). In I En. 48:10 it is said:

> on the day of their trouble there will be rest on the earth, and they will fall down before him and will not rise; and there will be no one who will take them in his hands and raise them, for they denied the Lord of Spirits and his Messiah.

and in I En. 52:4 an angel claims that "All these things which you have seen serve the authority of his Messiah, that he may be strong and powerful on the earth." However, it is again noteworthy to point out that in Enoch "the Messiah" is still not used in an absolute sense and of course there still remains some question as to when the Similitudes should be dated.

In the Psalms of Solomon Χριστός is used four times in the seventeenth and eighteenth Psalms. Here the references to Χριστός undoubtedly refer to the eschatological divine ruler. It is said that he will break the sinners with a rod of iron, will destroy the godless nations with the word of his mouth, and he will judge the peoples and nations in the wisdom of his righteousness (17:24-31). Nevertheless, even in the Psalms of Solomon, Χριστός is never found in the absolute form. It is always either "the Lord's anointed" or "his anointed."

---

[118] Marinus de Jonge, "Χρίω, Χριστός," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, IX, 513.

Thus, even here "Messiah" or "the Christ" does not seem to be a title, even though the expressions do refer to the eschatological figure.

The Dead Sea Scrolls likewise contain several references to the Messiah. Here there are references to two figures who are called "Messiah." One is a high-priest from Levi, such as 4QD6--the Damascus document--which speaks of "The Messiah out of Aaron and Israel," and the other is a king from Judah, such as in 4Q Patriarchal Blessing ("the Messiah of Righteousness . . . the Branch of David"). However other passages in the scrolls indicate only one Messiah. In almost all of the references "Messiah" occurs with an addition. However IQSa 2:12 may be an exception. The text of this scroll is damaged, but Millar Burrows translates this as "the Messiah."[119] On the other hand Geza Vermes has suggested that the true reading should be "the Priest-Messiah."[120] In either case, "the Messiah" by itself is rare (or non-existent) in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Yet, the scrolls do reveal a common use of "Messiah" referring to the coming eschatological ruler.

In the Jewish writings the use of "the Messiah" without qualifiers first occurs (without dispute) in the writings of the late first century A.D. "The first non-Christian book to use the phrase "the Messiah" in the absolute sense is the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch."[121] II Bar. 19:3 prophesies that "it shall come to pass when all is accomplished that was to come to pass in those parts, that the Messiah shall then begin to be revealed." Thus, in the Jewish writings there appears to be a progression

---

[119]Millar Burrows, More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1978), p. 395.

[120]Geza Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, p. 121.

[121]Sherman E. Johnson, "Christ," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, I, 564.

in the use of "Messiah" or "Christ" as a title describing the eschatological coming king.

In the Christian writings "the Christ" is often used in the absolute sense. Here it seems likely that the N.T. writers were drawing upon the earlier uses of Messiah in Judaism, but they also appear to be the first to use the term absolutely as a title.

> The OT-Jewish Χριστός κυρίου or αὐτοῦ occurs in the NT only in the Lucan writings. We often find the absolute ὁ Χριστός, which is very insecurely attested in the pre-Christian era and which occurs in older Jewish apocalypse only after Christ's own time. In Paul we also find quite often Χριστός without article.[122]

Thus, in the N.T. there is a continuation of the use of Messiah, that began in a rudimentary form in the O.T. and progressed through the intertestamental period. They drew upon an earlier understanding of "an anointed one" yet they were innovative in their titular use of "the Christ."

Conclusion

This chapter has evaluated a number of eschatological themes concerning the Messiah that are common in both the Jewish apocalyptic writings and the New Testament scriptures. Conclusions regarding the influence of the Jewish apocalyptic writings upon the authors of the New Testament have varied from theme to theme, but generally speaking one can say that the apocalypticists exerted a minor influence upon the later N.T. writings. An investigation of these themes has discovered that both the Jewish apocalyptic writings and the New Testament writings were heavily dependent upon Old Testament material (especially O.T. prophecy).

---

[122]Walter Grundmann, "Χρίω, Χριστός," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, IX, 527.

As a result, in many cases the subject matter in both bodies of literature exhibited similar expansions or developments of O.T. eschatological themes. In some of these cases it appears as though the New Testament is picking up on a new development first noted in the Jewish apocalyptic writings. Here it appears that the New Testament writers have acknowledged this new development. However, in other cases it seems most likely that the New Testament and the Jewish apocalyptic writings exhibit two independent developments of Old Testament themes.

Thus, the Jewish Apocalypticists have been both influential and noninfluential in the New Testament themes. Perhaps the greatest influence of the Apocalypticists involves the amplification of Old Testament eschatological themes. In this way, the Apocalypticists created a heated aura of eschatological Messianic expectation. The Christian writers had the benefit of experiencing this messianic advent. They continued the apocalyptic tradition by looking forward to the eschatological second coming.

Chapter 6

CONCLUSION

This paper, recognizing the apparent similarities between the intertestamental apocalyptic literature and many of the New Testament eschatological statements, has had the intention of trying to define the extent to which the latter writings have been influenced by the former. In particular, this paper has investigated the Messianic understandings of the Jewish Apocalyptic literature and has attempted to see how these understandings have been adopted, changed, or ignored in the New Testament writings.

In proceeding with this study, the author has investigated the historical background for this apocalyptic body of literature in order to understand the dynamics which led to its fullest expression during the intertestamental period. Here factors such as the exile, the loss of political independence, the loss of religious freedom, religious persecution, and the revival of religious and political aspirations have all led to a popularizing of this literature during the intertestamental period.

The next chapter undertook the very difficult task of attempting to date the various Jewish apocalyptic writings and attempted to discover which party of the Jews was responsible for the writings. Here it cannot be emphasized enough that the dating of these documents is based upon very tenuous evidence. Thus, the dating of some very important documents (such as the Similitudes of Enoch) have been dated either before or after the arrival of Christianity by respected scholars. These

dates have profound significance for the results of such a study as this, and for this reason it is important to be as fair as possible in dealing with this information.

The fourth chapter has dealt with the problem of the origin of apocalyptic literature. Here it was noted that there are two basic schools of thought: those who are inclined to find the origins of apocalyptic literature outside of the confines of Judaism, and those who are inclined to find the origins of apocalyptic within prophetic Judaism. This paper has found good reasons for siding with the latter position, while still maintaining that some of the minor details in the apocalyptic writings may have been borrowed from neighboring religions. Nevertheless the essential elements of apocalyptic can be found in the earlier prophets.

These first four chapters have all served as precursors to the fifth chapter. Here in the fifth chapter similar Messianic themes that occur in both the Jewish apocalyptic writings and the New Testament have been compared in order to evaluate the degree to which the one influenced the other. This comparison was done in three specific areas: concerning the use of the Son of Man, concerning the predicted signs and events that are supposed to accompany the coming of the Messiah, and concerning the various names of the Messiah.

In studying the influence of the apocalyptic writers upon the New Testament use of the Son of Man it was concluded that the apocalyptic writings probably had a small influence upon the New Testament usage. Here I Enoch is the major representative of the apocalyptic writings concerning the Son of Man. But during the investigation of the many-faceted meanings of the Son of Man in the Gospels, it was discovered that most

of the N.T. ideas were probably directly derived from the use of the Son of Man in Daniel 7 or from Ezekiel. One notable exception to this is in the titular use of the Son of Man. I Enoch apparently took Daniel's Son of Man and used the expression as a Messianic title. This is the first time that the Son of Man was used as a title. Thus, it seems that when Jesus used the expression as a Messianic title, he was probably following the lead of I Enoch. However, in many other aspects Jesus' use of the Son of Man differs from Enoch's use and in these areas Jesus' declarations concerning the Son of Man are probably better traced to the Old Testament or to the distinctive use made by Jesus himself.

As far as the predicted signs and events that were to accompany the coming of the Messiah, the results were much the same. The major apocalyptic themes that are found in both the apocalyptic writings and the New Testament eschatological accounts are also found to be themes in the Old Testament. This is true for such signs as earthquakes, famines, fire from heaven, disturbances with the sun, moon and stars; and with the theme of opposition to the Messiah and his people. However the period between 200 B.C. and A.D. 100 was a period in which significant growth occurred in these signs. The images may have had their roots in the Old Testament but during the intertestamental period, the apocalypticists intensified the imagery and systematized it into a number of specific "signs" of the coming Messianic age. Thus, the New Testament era owes a considerable debt to these apocalypticists who popularized and expanded apocalypticism. And as a result it can be seen that the Christian and Jewish apocalyptic writings acted and reacted with one another as there came to be a common pool of apocalyptic ideas and language. This is essentially the same conclusion reached by Leon Morris: "It is quite possible that within certain Jewish circles a generally accepted symbolism was widely

understood. This would be supported by the way different apocalypses make use of the same kind of imagery."[1] Again, as with the Son of Man, this is not to say that Apocalyptic had no influence in this area. But this does say that in the area of major apocalyptic signs and events, the influence of the apocalypticists was of no greater significance than the Old Testament and probably was much less. The major contribution of the Apocalypticists seems to lie in their new emphasis and magnification of Old Testament apocalyptic elements.

In examing the various Messianic names in both the apocalyptic writings and the New Testament the results were again similar. The expressions "Son of God" and "Son of David" are both expressions that can be found in the Old Testament. Here the apocalyptic writings give no indication of influencing the New Testament writings. The same can be said for the belief in a Messiah coming from the tribe of Levi. The N.T. writings nowhere agree with a Levitical Messiah. However, the belief in a Messiah from the tribe of Levi (or from Aaron) could have prompted the discussion of Christ's priesthood coming from the Melchizedek line in Hebrews 5-7. The author of Hebrews could have even been influenced by the Melchizedek teachings of the Qumran community, but even if this is admitted, Hebrew's use of Melchizedek is different from the use made by the Qumran literature. And finally, in the use of the name "Messiah" or "Christ" the N.T. writers probably picked up on a theme that was popularized by the apocalyptic writers, though the roots of the idea probably extended into the Old Testament.

Thus, it could be said that "the Christian writer shows that he is not unacquainted with apocalyptic terminology and ideas but he does

---

[1] Leon Morris, Apocalyptic (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ., 1972), pp. 36-37.

not write simply as a representative of apocalypticism. He writes from his own distinctive standpoint."[2]

---

[2]Ibid., p. 77.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dictionaries and Encyclopedias

Gasque, W. W. "Apocalyptic Literature." The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible, ed. Merrill C. Tenney. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publ. House, 1976, I, 200-4.

Ladd, George Eldon. "Apocalyptic Literature." The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ., 1979, I, 151-61.

Rist, Martin. "Apocalypticism." The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, ed. George Arthur Buttrick. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962, I, 157-61.

R[ussell], D[avid] S[yme]. "Apocalyptic Literature." Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1965, II, 112-15.

Thomson, J. E. H. "Apocalyptic Literature." The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia, ed. James Orr. Chicago: Howard-Severance, 1915, I, 161-78.

Editions and Translations

Bissell, Edwin Cone. The Apocrypha. Vol. XV, Commentary on the Holy Scriptures: Critical, Doctrinal, and Homiletical, ed. John Peter Lange, trans. Philip Schaff. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1880.

Black, Matthew. Apocalypsis Henochi Graece. Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testament Graece, ed. A. M. Denis et M. de Jonge. Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1970.

Box, G. H. The Apocalypse of Ezra: II Esdras III-XIV. Translations of Early Documents. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1917.

Charles, R. H., ed. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.

_____. The Ascension of Isaiah. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1900.

_____. The Book of Enoch or I Enoch. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912.

_____. The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis. Translations of Early Documents. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1917.

_____. The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1960.

_____. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Translations of Early Documents. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1917.

Harris, J. Rendel. The Odes and Psalms of Solomon. 2d ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911.

Jonge, M. De. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text. Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1978.

Knibb, Michael A. The Ethiopic Book of Enoch. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.

Laurence, Richard. The Book of Enoch the Prophet. 3d ed. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1838.

Ryle, Herbert Edward, and Montague Rhodes James. Psalms of the Pharisees. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1891.

Stone, Michael E. The Armenian Version of IV Ezra. University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies, No. 1. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1979.

Books

Archer, Gleason L., Jr. A Survey of Old Testament Introduction. Chicago: Moody Press, 1974.

Borsch, Fredrick Houk. The Son of Man in Myth and History. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967.

Bright, John. A History of Israel. 3d ed. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1981.

Brockington, L. H. A Critical Introduction to the Apocrypha. London: Gerald Duckworth, 1961.

Bruce, F. F. Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ., 1961.

Burkitt, F. Crawford. Jewish and Christian Apocalypses. London: British Academy, 1914.

Burrows, Millar. Burrows on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1978.

Casey, Maurice. Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1979.

Charles, R. H. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John. 2 vols. The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1920.

_____. A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism, and in Christianity. 2d ed. London: A & C Black, 1913.

_____. Religious Development Between the Old and New Testaments. Home University Library of Modern Knowledge, No. 94. London: Williams and Norgate, 1927.

Charlesworth, James H. The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research with a Supplement. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series, No. 75. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981.

Cross, Frank M., Jr. The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1958.

Dalman, G. H. The Words of Jesus. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902.

Davenport, Gene L. The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees. Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1971.

Davies, W. D. Christian Origins and Judaism. London: Darton, Longmans, and Todd, 1962.

Deane, William J. Pseudepigrapha: An Account of Certain Apocryphal Sacred Writings of the Jews and Early Christians. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1891.

Dentan, Robert C. The Apocrypha, Bridge of the Testaments. Greenwich, CT: Seabury Press, 1954.

Dupont-Sommer, A. The Essene Writings From Qumran, trans. G. Vermes, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1961.

Eissfeldt, Otto. The Old Testament: An Introduction, trans. Peter R. Ackroyd. New York: Harper and Row Publ., 1965.

Ferrar, William John. The Uncanonical Jewish Books. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1925.

Frost, Stanley Brice. Old Testament Apocalyptic: Its Origins and Growth. London: Epworth Press, 1952.

Funk, Robert W. ed. Apocalypticism. Journal for Theology and the Church, No. 6. New York: Herder and Herder, 1969.

Glasson, T. F. Greek Influence in Jewish Eschatology with Special Reference to the Apocalypses and Pseudepigraphs. London: S.P.C.K., 1961.

Goppelt, Leonhard. Theology of the New Testament, trans. John E. Alsup. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1981.

Guthrie, Donald. New Testament Theology. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1981.

Hanson, Paul D. The Dawn of Apocalyptic. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.

Harrison, Roland Kenneth. Introduction to the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ., 1969.

Hartman, Lars. Prophecy Interpreted: The Formation of Some Jewish Apocalyptic Texts and of the Eschatological Discourse Mark 13 par. Coniectanes Biblica New Testament Series, No. 1. Uppsala, Sweden: Almquist and Wiksells, 1966.

Hawley, Charles Arthur. The Teaching of Apocrypha and Apocalypse. New York: Association Press, 1925.

Higgins, A. J. B. The Son of Man in the Teaching of Jesus. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Hooker, Morna D. The Son of Man in Mark. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1967.

Jeremias, Joachim. The Eucharistic Words of Jesus. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966.

_____. Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969.

_____. New Testament Theology I: The Proclamation of Jesus. London: SCM Press, 1971.

_____. The Prayers of Jesus. Naperville, IL: Alec R. Allenson, 1967.

Jonge, M. de, ed. Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1975.

Josephus. Antiquities of the Jews, trans. William Whiston. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1974.

_____. The Wars of the Jews, trans. William Whiston. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1974.

Klausner, Joseph. Jesus of Nazareth: His Life, Times, and Teaching, trans. Herbert Danby. New York: Macmillan, 1945.

_____. The Messianic Idea in Israel: From Its Beginning to the Completion of the Mishnah, trans. W. F. Stinespring. New York: Macmillan, 1955.

Koch, Klaus. The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic. Studies in Biblical Theology, Second Series, No. 22. Naperville, IL: Allenson, 1972.

Ladd, George Eldon. Jesus and the Kingdom: The Eschatology of Biblical Realism. New York: Harper and Row Publ., 1964.

_____. A Theology of the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ., 1974.

LaSor, William Sanford. The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1972.

McNamara, Martin. Targum and Testament: Aramaic Paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible: A Light on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ., 1972.

Manson, William. Jesus the Messiah. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1946.

Metzger, Bruce M. An Introduction to the Apocrypha. New York: Oxford University Press, 1957.

Milik, J. T. The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.

Morris, Leon. Apocalyptic. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ., 1972.

Moule, C. F. D. The Origin of Christology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

_____. The Phenomenon of the New Testament. Studies in Biblical Theology, Second Series, No. 1. Naperville, IL: Alec. R. Allenson, 1967.

Mowinckel, Sigmund O. He that Cometh. New York: Abingdon, 1954.

Nickelsburg, George W. E. Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981.

Nickelsburg, George W. E., Jr., ed. Studies on the Testament of Moses. Septuagint and Cognate Studies, No. 4. Cambridge, MA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973.

Noth, Martin, The History of Israel. 2d ed. New York: Harper and Row Publ., 1960.

Oesterley, W. O. E. The Books of the Apocrypha: Their Origin, Teaching and Contents. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1914.

_____. An Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1935.

_____. The Jews and Judaism During the Greek Period: The Background of Christianity. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1941.

Porter, Frank Chamberlin. The Messages of the Apocalyptical Writers, Vol. 8. The Messages of the Bible, ed. Frank K. Sanders and Charles F. Kent. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905.

Rad, Gerhard von. Old Testament Theology, trans. D. M. G. Stalker. New York: Harper and Row Publ., 1965.

Richardson, Alan. An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament. New York: Harper and Brothers Publ., 1958.

Ringgren, Helmer. The Messiah in the Old Testament. Chicago: Allenson, 1956.

Rost, Leonhard. Judaism Outside the Hebrew Canon: An Introduction to the Documents. Nashville: Abingdon, 1976.

Rowley, Harold H. Jewish Apocalyptic and the Dead Sea Scrolls. London: University of London, Athlone Press, 1957.

_____. The Relevance of Apocalyptic: A Study of Jewish and Christian Apocalypses from Daniel to the Revelation. Rev. ed. New York: Association Press, 1964.

Russell, D. S. Apocalyptic: Ancient and Modern. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978.

_____. Between the Testaments. London: SCM Press, 1960.

_____. The Jews from Alexander to Herod. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967.

_____. The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964.

Sandmel, Samuel. Judaism and Christian Beginnings. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Schmithals, Walter. The Apocalyptic Movement, trans. John E. Steely. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1975.

Schürer, Emil. The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ. Rev. ed. by Geza Vermes, Fergas Millar, and Matthew Black. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1979.

Schweitzer, Albert. The Quest of the Historical Jesus. New York: Macmillan, 1948.

Simon, Marcel. Jewish Sects at the Time of Jesus, trans. James H. Farley. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.

Thomson, John E. H. Books Which Influenced Our Lord and His Apostles: Being a Critical Review of Apocalyptic Jewish Literature. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1891.

Torrey, C. C. The Apocalypse of John. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958.

_____. The Apocryphal Literature: A Brief Introduction. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1945.

VanderKam, James C. Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees. Harvard Semitic Monographs, No. 14. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977.

Vermes, Geza. The Dead Sea Scrolls in English. 2d ed. New York: Penguin Books, 1975.

Periodicals

Andrews, H. T. "The Message of Jewish Apocalyptic for Modern Times." The Expositor, XIV (1917), 58-71.

Bauckham, Richard J. "The Rise of Apocalyptic." Themelios, III, No. 2 (1978), 10-23.

Beardslee, W. A. "New Testament Apocalyptic in Recent Interpretation." Interpretation, XXV (1971), 419-35.

Beasley-Murray, G. R. "The Rise and Fall of the Little Apocalypse Theory." Expository Times, LXIV (1952-1953), 346-49.

Berry, George Ricker. "The Apocalyptic Literature of the Old Testament." Journal of Biblical Literature, LXII (1943), 9-16.

Betz, H. D. "The Concept of Apocalyptic in the Theology of the Pannenberg Group." Journal for Theology and Church, VI (1969), 192-207.

Bruce, F. F. "A Reappraisal of Jewish Apocalyptic Literature." Review and Expositor, LXXII (1975), 305-15.

Buber, M. "Prophecy, Apocalyptic, and the Historical Hour." Union Seminary Quarterly, XII (1957), 9-21.

Davies, W. D. "Unsolved New Testament Problems: The Jewish Background of the Teachings of Jesus: Apocalyptic and Pharisaism." Expository Times, LIX (1947-1948), 233-37.

Emerton, J. A. "Origin of the Son of Man Imagery." Journal of Theological Studies, IX (1958), 225-42.

Frost, S. B. "Eschatology and Myth." Vestus Testamentum, II (1952), 70-80.

Glasson, T. Francis. "Apocalyptic Ideas of Judaism Contemporary with Our Lord." The London Quarterly and Holborn Review, XXIX (1960), 166-70.

_____. "Apocalyptic--Some Current Delusions." The London Quarterly and Holborn Review, XXI (1952), 104-10.

_____. "Jesus Christ and Christian Apocalypticism." Modern Churchman, XXXIX (1949), 33-42.

Habel, N. C. "Introducing the Apocalyptic Visions of Daniel 7." Concordia Theological Monthly, XLI (1970), 10-26.

Hadfield, P. "Iranian Influences on Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic." London Quarterly and Holborn Review, XXVII (1958), 216-20.

Hanson, Paul D. "Jewish Apocalyptic Against Its Near Eastern Environment." Revue Biblique, LXXVIII (1971), 31-58.

Jones, Bruce W. "More About the Apocalypse as Apocalyptic." Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXIVV (1968), 325-27.

Kallas, James. "The Apocalypse--An Apocalyptic Book?" Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXVI (1967), 69-80.

Kohler, K. "The Essenes and the Apocalyptic Literature." Jewish Quarterly Review, XI (1920-1921), 145-68.

Ladd, George Eldon. "The Origin of Apocalyptic in Biblical Religion." The Evangelical Quarterly, XXX (1958), 140-46.

_____. "Place of Apocalyptic in Biblical Religion." Evangelical Quarterly, XXX (1958), 75-85.

_____. "The Revelation and Jewish Apocalyptic." The Evangelical Quarterly, XXIX (1957), 94-100.

_____. "Why Not Prophetic-Apocalyptic?" Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXVI (1957), 192-200.

Leivestad, R. "Exit the Apocalyptic Son of Man." New Testament Studies, XVIII (1972), 243-67.

McGown, C. C. "Hebrew and Egyptian Apocalyptic Literature." Harvard Theological Review, XVIII (1925), 357-411.

Murdock, W. R. "History and Revelation in Jewish Apocalypticism." Interpretation, XXI (1967), 167-87.

Perrin, N. "Son of Man in Ancient Judaism and Primitive Christianity: A Suggestion." Biblical Research, XI (1966), 17-28.

Rollins, Wayne C. "The New Testament and Apocalyptic." New Testament Studies, XVII (1971), 454-76.

Roth, Wolfgang. "Between Tradition and Expectation: The Origin and Role of Biblical Apocalyptic." Explor, IV (1978), 3-14.

Schmidt, N. "The Origin of Jewish Eschatology." Journal of Biblical Literature, XLI (1922), 102-14.

Snyder, G. F. "The Literalization of the Apocalyptic Form in the New Testament Church." Biblical Research, XIV (1969), 5-18.

Stone, Michael Edward. "The Book of Enoch and Judaism in the Third Century B.C.E." The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XL (1978), 479-92.

Travis, Stephen H. "The Value of Apocalyptic." Tyndale Bulletin, XXX (1979), 53-76.

Wilder, A. N. "The Nature of Jewish Eschatology." Journal of Biblical Literature, L (1931), 201-6.